1.293

# CLIENTAL POLITICS IN THE U.S. FOREIGN RELATIONS: A CASE STUDY OF PAKISTAN-U.S. STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP 2001-2010



A dissertation submitted to the School of politics and international Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy in International Relations.

By

#### **Muhammad Arshad**

Registration No. 02131013006

# **School of Politics and International Relations**

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad

2013

## QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No.SPIR/2013-

Dated: December 11, 2013

Laws

#### FINAL APPROVAL LETTER

This is to certify that we have read the dissertation by Mr. Muhammad Arshad and in our judgment it is up to the standard of acceptance by Quaid-i-Azam University for the grant of degree of Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) in International Relations.

#### 1. Supervisor

Dr. Syed Qandil Abbas Assistant Professor School of Politics and International Relations Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.

# 2. External Examiner

Dr. Saima Kayani Defence and Diplomatic Studies Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi.

#### 3. Director

Dr. Zafar Nawaz Jaspal School of Politics and International Relations Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.

# Dedicated

To My beloved Mother

Who was the Best Gift of Almighty Allah All praises to Allah Almighty, The benevolent and most Merciful whose blessings enabled me to accomplish this piece of writing successfully.

I am unable to find appropriate words to offer my humble thanks and pay my immense gratitude to my respected and worthy supervisor **Dr. Qandeel Abbas**, who showed commendable alacrity in providing proper guidance and encouragement. Besides of being a supervisor, he is very humble, cooperative and sympathetic to me.

Special thanks are due to **Dr. Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, the Director of SPIR**, My Respected Teachers Dr. Tahir Ameen, Dr. Lubna Abid Ali, Dr. Nazir Hussain and Dr. Mawra Anayat for their valuable affection and guidance. Sincere thanks to all my class fellows and friends specifically, Shoaib Khan, Sajid Khan, Afzal and Shahzad for their valuable support and encouragement.

I am also very thankful to Dr. David Jonnes for his valuable help and precious guidance in my research work.

I express my special gratitude to my sweet and loving brother Asad Ali Wattoo and sister for their support and encouragement throughout my academic life.

# List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

US

United States of America

NATO

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

CIA

Central Intelligence Agency

**LDCs** 

**Less Developed Countries** 

TAPI

Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India Pipeline

SEATO

South East Asian Treaty Organization

CENTO

Central Treaty Organization

OBL

Osama Bin Laden

CSF

**Coalition Support Fund** 

OEF

Operation Enduring Freedom

CIA

Central Investigation Agency

ISI

Inter Services Intelligence

WTO

World Trade Organization

IL

International Law

UN

**United Nations** 

#### Abstract

This study focuses mainly on four sections, firstly it argues about the historical dimensions of cliental political relations between Pakistan and the United States. Secondly it focuses on Ideological dynamics of cliental politics in Pakistan and US strategic partnership and how this partnership has been functional despite ideological disparities on bilateral level in effective way in the war on terror. Thirdly, it analyses the nature of Security relationship between strategic partners that how their security concerns has affected the relationship mutually to ensure respective security concerns in the regional and global level. Cooperation on bilateral level in terms of security ensures the peace in the regional context by countering terrorism. Fourthly, this section focuses on economic and political dimension of cliental politics that the increased economic dependence not only consolidates the affectivity of cliental relations but also minimize the worth of client state in the world political arena. Over reliance of the small state decrease its value as an international personality. It also argues that Islamabad provided every possible support to the United States up to its utmost capacity but it could not be successful to even get the political support of the superior partner for the solution of Kashmir issue. The only visible reason assessed in case of Washington is that it wanted to pursue its vested interests in the region to maintain its hegemony without giving due respect to the client's concerns that can be detrimental to the durability of this strategic partnership in the long run. The prospects of the strategic partnership are uncertain due to occasional non-compliance of the client and due to the Washington pursuance of self-satisfactory policy. This occasional reluctance to cooperate and non-compliance transforming this strategic partnership to the stage of estranged clientage that is lethal to the smoothness of strategic partnership and may lead to break up if irritants could not understand to bring the relationship in the sustainable equality. This outcome could only be achieved if both sides realize mutual interests and minimize the effects of irritants involved by adopting pragmatic approach towards contradictory issues.

# Contents

Dedication

Acknowledgements

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Abstract

INTRODUCTION6
Statement of the Problem
Hypothesis
Objective of the Study18
Significance of the Study19
Methodology21
Theories Applied21
Organization of Study21
<u>CHAPTER ONE26</u>
Theoretical_Framework26
General Description of the Theory26
Basis of the Theory27
Ideal Model28
Phases of Cliental Politics28
Dimensions of Cliental Politics29
Dynamics of Estranged Clientage Scenario in Pakistan-US Case Study30

Cliental Politics	Applied at Int	erstate Leve	d	30		
Elements of Clie	ental Politics a	t Interstate I	Level	32		
Application of Study				outes at	Pakistan-US	S Case
Literature Revie	w			34		
Findings of Liter	rature Review			42		
CHAPTER TWO	D			45		
Historical 2000					Relations	1947-
Cordial Rela					Alliance	1947-
Economic and M	lilitary Aid: A	Price of Lo	yalty 1953	3-6248		
Relationship wi				Revising	the Foreign	Policy
Isolation and 80					g Powers	1971-
Afghanistan E	*.				n the US	1980-
Post Cold War D	Dilemma and N	Juclear Issue	1990-200	0058		
CHAPTER THE	EE			63		
Ideological Politics	The state of the s	gence/Diver		an 63	d C	Cliental
Role of Ideology	in Cliental Re	elations		63		
Pakistan-US Rel	ations in the V	Vake of Con	nmunism	65		
Ideological Pers	pective of Pak	istan and the	United St	tates.68		
An Ideological A	Alliance to Stra	ntegic Partne	ership	71		
Militancy and A	merica			76		
Confrontation	between	Imperial	USA	and	Militancy	Post

9/1178
Pakistan-US Ideological Divergence and Client-Patron Dynamics in the Post 9/11 Phase80
Pakistan-Afghanistan Ideological Affinity and War on Terror
Pakistan-US Ideological Affinity or Disparity in Post 9/11 Era85
United States Imperialistic and Ideological Goals87
CHAPTER FOUR91
Security Oriented Military Alliance and Pakistan-US Relations 2001-201091
Security Perspective in Cliental Political Relationship94
Perspective of US Security Policy in Post 9/11 Era96
Shift of Security Paradigms in the US Foreign Policy Post 9/11 Phase98
Pakistan-US Military Cooperation in the War on Terror.100
Military Assistance: A Myth or Reality102
Pakistan-US Nexus and Future of Afghanistan104
Policy Divergence in Pakistan-US Strategic Alliance106
Pakistan and Taliban
Security Challenges to Pakistan and US in Post 9/11 Phase
CHAPTER FIVE113
Pakistan-US Economic and Political Ties 2001-2010.113
Role of Economy in Cliental Relations115
Economic Dependence Consolidates Cliental Relations 117

	Econon		~ .				in	21 <sup>st</sup>
Double St	andards in	America	n Foreign l	Policy	12	20		
Political C	Cooperation	n: Two W	ay Traffic		12	21		
Pakistan's	Economic	and Poli	tical Intere	ests	12	23		
	States				~		Wake	of
Afghan E <sub>l</sub>	oisode				12	28		
Indian Fac	ctor				13	0		
	Russia y						to	US
CONCLU	SION		***********		13	8		
BIBLIOG	RAPHY				14	8		

#### INTRODUCTION:

In the world of politics, one natural outcome of the interactions of the states is that the stronger seeks to control the action of weaker state in terms of its policies with other states, these be economic, political or military. In the world political arena, trends have changed with the passage of time, with the technological developments and diplomatic maturity of tactics employed. However, "might is right" has been a crystal clear political reality, with all its repercussions. It is very much evident from the political history, whosoever came into power eventually, tried to control the ways of states interactions.

Cliental politics has been a unique approach of dealing with the weaker states by the imperial powers after the Second World War when new borne independent colonies remained under the influence of their former masters even after getting liberated. Cliental politics creates a relationship of dependency between the rich and the poor, where stronger uses the weaker for the fulfillment of its goals and policies and award certain rewards and political support as a token money for the services provided. It is quite obvious that in cliental relations, less consideration is given to the weaker partner's interests overall, while the strong party demands for full compliance by the weaker because of having upper hand and powerful status. Sometimes, this relationship reaches to the top of the odds when client starts demonstrating the non-compliance to the demands of imperial power.

In political science the phenomenon of cliental politics is not new; it is as old as the subject itself. The world has witnessed in different ages of the human history that the stronger and the weaker have been poles apart and their relationship have been unique in nature. In Power Politics weaker states had to bend down before the stronger and the stronger creates such circumstances and compels weaker states to be submissive. The current political system of the world is no different from this phenomenon of power politics. In power politics, weaker is compelled to be compliant directly as was the case in Peloposonian war between Spartans and Athens or within the domain of cliental relations, subordinate has to submit to its master due to increased dependence. After the cold war the United States emerged as a sole superpower in the world.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Hafeez Malik, US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan (London: Oxford University press, 2008), 39.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

They interfered in the affairs of emerging states in general and under-developed states in particular to influence their policies to control the world and maintain its monopoly. The divides of developed and under-developed is quite visible where developed states wanted to control and manipulate the less developed countries (LDC) politically and economically. That's why the United States intervenes in the affairs of poor and weaker states to maintain its influence, by molding their policies and to get access to their resources and strategic locations so that it could ensure its superpower status and maintain the world political system. Muslim world has suffered a lot because the United States has mostly intervened in the affairs of Muslim countries as they perceive them a real threat to their hegemonic status so is the case with Pakistan.

Furthermore, trends of world politics took a new turn after the 9/11 terrorist attacks with the changing face of policy politics of the nations. The Bush administration perceived that September 11 attacks were attack on the Christian civilization and gave an option to the world of being far or against. The Washington perceived these terrorist attacks a biggest blow to its existence and glory. Iraq and Afghanistan suffered from the direct wrath of the Washington as a result of these terrorist attacks which accused Afghanistan's Taliban regime as being behind, although, it was proved later that few Middle Eastern exiles person were involved, and that they had no connection with Afghanistan and Iraq. As a result of which, the United States inflicted unbearable penalty upon Iraq and Afghanistan on which many say, is for a hold in this south Asian strategic region so as to contain Iran, China and Russia in Pursuit of great game.<sup>3</sup>

Washington has continuously maintained specific relationship with the newly emerging Pakistan ever since the beginning. However, this is ironic that Washington never treated Pakistan with the due course of action and pressurized to act according to its demands and objectives. The United States successfully established cliental relations with different states of the world in a specific course of time like with Iran during Shah's regime. But Pakistan is a unique case scenario in its sense because a very low level cooperation, security stability and political assurances extended as a reward of its joining the capitalist block and opposing the Soviet Union (USSR).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Akbar Nasir Khan, "The US Policy of Target Killing by Drones in Pakistan." *Institute of Policy and Research Islamabad*, Journal 11, No. 1, Summer (2011): 38.

Moreover, Washington consideration to Islamabad's security reached at lowest ebb when it provided only diplomatic support on the occasion of its wars with India and many other occasions as well. Once again Islamabad became significant on the occasion of Afghan war against the Soviet Union and provided full scale military equipment to dismantle the Soviet forces by the America. This strategic partnership is different in its essence because Pakistan used in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union and left alone in the post cold war times. The United States pressurized Islamabad to either support in the war on terror or to get ready to face the music after 9/11 attacks on Pentagon.

In the strategic relations of the United States and Islamabad, bilateral cooperation seems quite unique, tricky and event oriented on part of the US but forceful on Islamabad to comply with it in any case. This is a clear indicator of the Islamabad increased dependence on the Washington extended aid which is lethal for the autonomy and sovereignty of small partner in the strategic regional environment. In this context, except many other factors, Pakistan got involved in the war on terror more importantly due to its geo-strategic location in the region and other stakes affiliated to this. There is no denying the fact that to wage the war on terror in Afghanistan was almost too difficult to launch without the help of Pakistan because of its close ties and geographical proximities with Kabul. Although, relations between the US and Pakistan has fluctuated in the past, the later was economically dependent state on the former and so was left with no option but to join in the war on terror as a frontline, Non-NATO ally. However, it is ironic that the Musharraf regime accepted all the American demands without any condition on a single phone call, an outcome that was never expected by the Pentagon.<sup>4</sup>

In the post 9/11 terrorist attacks on America, world dynamics of foreign policy changed as the Imperial power threatened Pakistan of dire consequences if it does not comply which brought severe political and diplomatic pressure on Islamabad's policy makers at large. As a result of that, Pakistan became frontline ally to combat the menace of terrorism for certain compulsions to escape from the wrath of stronger partner. Since then Pakistan has acted as a front line ally of the United States in the region in this exclusive war, waged against the suspected terrorists of Afghanistan.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Samir Amin, Beyond US Hegemony: Assessing the Prospects of Multipolar World (London: Zed Book, 2006), 188.

There is no denying the fact despite cooperation, Pakistan has raised many questions regarding violation of its sovereignty, stability and integrity that is a primary concern for policy making at present. Pakistan suffered heavy price in the shape of death of thousands of soldiers, billions of dollars loss in war on terror and political instability within the state. As a result, this strategic alliance between Islamabad and Washington brought Pakistan on the verge of breakdown and insecurity was the fate of its innocent citizens as a result of continuous drone attacks within its boarder. However, nature of relationship and trends of policies of both the partners towards each other have been very unique in its sense in case of Pakistan and the United Stats case scenario because despite clashes cooperation is still continued even on small scale.

With the changing dynamics of the foreign policy in the post 9/11 era, the U.S. gave an ultimatum to Pakistan either to join Washington or side with the Al-Qaeda and Taliban, and ready to 'be bombed back to the stone age', which brought tremendous pressure on the continuation of ongoing policies and decision makers, so Pakistan ultimately become frontline ally in the war on terrorism.<sup>5</sup> This presented Musharraf regime an opportunity to prove his worth as a clever politician to acquire a position as a leader of the country and transform the Pakistan from the producer of the extremism and terrorism to become an actor without whose cooperation the United States and its allies cannot win the war on terror. Musharraf availed himself of the opportunity for his own survival and preservation of regime. In other words, he was able to promote the claim that what was good for him was also good for the country. He became indispensable for what was required to save Pakistan and combat the terrorism. This was similar to the one of his predecessor general in Afghan war during which he got the opportunity to make himself fortunate and revived strategic importance of Pakistan to fight against the Soviet Union. So, Pakistan became a frontline ally of the US and its allies in the combat against terrorism with all its pros and cons. Furthermore, blame game of US against Pakistan's secret agency having involvement in supporting the terrorism leave a big question mark on the policy making of Pakistan and surely creating disappointment in the circles of foreign policy makers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Pervez Musharraf, *In the line of fire* (London: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 19.

They have been supporting war on terror and fought two wars in their own country by accepting the demands of America to launch operations in Swat and South Waziristan still mantra to 'do more' is going on. Islamabad and Washington have a complex relationship that is a challenge for both the countries policy makers most probably for Pakistan.<sup>6</sup> In the previous decades Pakistan and the United States remained close allies with mutual dependence to each other. With the end of cold war a new era of Pakistan-US relations started. Though, cliental relations had existed between Pakistan and United States during cold war when Islamabad fought a proxy war of Washington but many new scenarios emerged with new challenges and clashes erupted in the policy making formulation after 9/11 terrorist attacks, on the issue of Afghanistan. Lack of consensus on the policy priorities on the future of war ridden Afghanistan, a very least response to the Pakistan's security concerns in the eve of continuous drone attacks has further aggravated the situation. Indian involvement in the Afghan issue and western boarder infiltration bringing the stability poles apart in Pakistan and regional level.

The Past couple of decades have changed the political scene of the world, end of cold war, terrorist attacks in 2001 and attack on Iraq and Afghanistan has totally changed the trends of politics and states interactions. In this regard, politics and diplomacy has turned a new face to the South Asian region by bringing many new conditions and challenges for the U.S. The United States wanted to cope with the emerging situation in South Asia in terms of security and terror. Positive relations with Pakistan can help the US to address all the challenges in the ongoing war on terror and major security challenges to it at the regional level. It is quite clear that Pakistan and the United States have become strong partners again in the wake of 9/11 attacks. Pakistan-US relations have evolved in couple of past years and took different ways and a new paradigm. It is crystal clear in terms of Afghanistan attack, Musharraf undue support and from the most controversial Kerry Lugar bill. Pakistan being dependent on the US has grown economically, militarily and politically, however, it is unable to play her independent role in South Asia due to increased dependence.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Selig S. Harrison, "Pakistan: The State of the Union." Center for International Policy, April (2009): 24.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Jones Own Bennett, *Pakistan Eye of the Storm (*London: Yale University Press New Haven, 2002), 5.

Contrary to this, people of Pakistan were against the Kerry-Lugar bill, the US policies in Afghanistan and because of day to day threat to sovereignty of Pakistan in terms of drone attacks. Despite this Pakistan government is cooperating with the policies of United States by overruling the whims and wishes of the masses. It clearly shows there exist a diversity and disharmony in the government and masses priorities. A major policy shift after the 9/11 in Pakistan's foreign policy made it crystal clear that Pakistan is a dependent state and it is in strong grip of the United States. Status of states dependencies have been varying as in past Iran had a client state status vis-à-vis America in shah's regime. One distinguished feature of Pakistan and the United States case study is that domestic politics in Pakistan is too far from stability, its dictatorial regimes and semi-democratic governments has made it more vulnerable for the foreign involvement by making it a weaker and dependant on the largest actor America in the international political scene. Pakistan always used when needed and later on left helpless so as expected after war on terror. It suffered heavy price in shape of death of thousands of soldiers, billions of rupee dollars loss in WOT, political instability and continuous sense of insecurity.

Pakistan and the United States have been through periods of ups and downs in their relationship ever since Pakistan came into being on the political map of the world. The nature of relationship between the two countries is full of paradoxes that seek attention. While taking into account the brief history of Pakistan and United States relations it is clearly understandable that the United States always came closer to Pakistan when it needed her for the fulfillment of her geo-strategic and political interests. During Cold War period the United States was in search of alliances so warmly welcomed Pakistan. On the other hand, Pakistan due to its security concerns and threat perceptions from India become strategic ally of the U.S. From the initial stages, the United States mediated Indo-Pak problem like water and Kashmir issue. However wars of 1965-71 proved to be decisive when American policy makers demonstrated neutral stance and remained aloof from Pakistan despite defense pacts and close strategic ties. The two countries have a complex relationship that is a challenge for both the countries policy makers. Pakistan has to give a heavy price for the combat to terror by deploying a major part of army on the western boarder by weakening eastern boarder. Energy crises doubled in the economically fragile

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Amer Rizwan, "South Asian Security Complex and Pakistan United States Relations Post 9/11." *IPRI Journal* X, No. 2, Summer (2010): 47.

Pakistan as due to war no one was willing to invest in the Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan and India (TAPI) pipeline project.

However, it seems true that Pakistan has a well trained, large and well armed army which makes it a regional power, US on the other hand has stretched her army and trying to encircle the world economic resources and in geo-strategic terms which is diminishing its role as a hegemonic state. Pakistan has helped and continued to help its master in its competition in the world especially against the Soviet Union that is showing its complete compliant tendencies towards stronger partner. However, the perception of this relationship between Islamabad and Washington is far from stability and permanence in the eyes of world. Pakistan has developed its status of regional power by acquiring nuclear capabilitis but it does not mean that it could shake the stronghold of superpower in the region but can surely disturb the US policies if wanted so and perceive its policies extremely detrimental to Pakistan's survival and security. Pakistan will remain an ally of US in the future because of its geo-strategic location that makes it significant for the United States policies in this strategic region and for its own economic dependence on the largest partner. Both the states would cooperate on mutual benefits and threats like war on terror. In case of divergence of interests or if Pakistan key strategic interests suppressed by the master then Islamabad can take a different or opposing posture with the demonstration of non-compliance behavior to the US. It is reality that respecting and caring each other interests in such kind of relationship would make this relationship strong and better. The future better relations will be possible if both the parties would work out certain course of action for mutual benefits.

The United States a torch-bearer of democracy, embraced a military dictator in Pakistan in the post 9/11 terrorist attacks only to secure her way to Afghanistan so that the United States could bring back her ally with a new contact under different terms and a new project. Both the countries have been dancing on different rhythms since the beginning. Pakistan paid much attention to Washington due to close alliance of Soviet Union and India. However, the economic and military aid was given to Pakistan to keep it out of Soviet spell. Despite Musharraf refusal to make Pakistan a launching ground against the Taliban, the United States considered Pakistan a key ally in the war on terror. The concerns over nuclear weapons are no longer a focus of the US foreign policy towards Pakistan except that US wanted to keep these weapons out of anti American element's reach. A decade has passed after the start of war on terror in which role of Pakistan has been mainly focused to counter the extremist factions within Pakistan.

The US security cooperation with Pakistan is a key to meet its objectives in the region. The Geostrategic location of Pakistan make it a critical point in the war on terror, providing much more military support to the US and Allies for the operation in Afghanistan.<sup>9</sup>

However, by supporting war on terror in Afghanistan, Pakistan government gained favorable opinion from the US and allies but its masses hatred got momentum against Washington due to the continuous drone attacks and economic losses inflicted upon the innocent civilians. Relations between Pakistan and the US came to a sensitive juncture after the Raymond Davis case and especially post Osama Bin Laden episode (OBL). While Pakistan is experiencing worst ever economic, political and security situation in the post 9/11 scenario. The US maintaining its support for Pakistan despite intense internal pressure while Pakistan needs Washington more to tackle the security issues and avoid the country to become dysfunctional.

On the other hand, the United States also needed Pakistan to support its arm forces and NATO forces in Afghanistan and to control the terrorism sponsoring hands from within the Pakistan. There is a need for both the countries to revise their strategies and priorities because mere economic support would not bring the country at the point of stability but there is need to avoid violating the sovereignty of the country. It has become equally impossible to determine Pakistan's relations with the external worlds more significantly, special relations with the United States after a decade long war on terror in Afghanistan. However, the United States has continued her special relationship with Pakistan, despite all reservations and threat perceptions to pentagon. But this relationship has more challenges within Pakistan and beyond its boarders. With the strong anti-Americanism within state there are many concerns in Pakistan that whether this relationship is mere a dependence or interest based. On the other hand, many doubts on Pakistan's loyalty and its extended support in the war on terror for the US and her allies keep them suspicious like previous governments.

However, there is no denying the fact that mere war on terror does not explain the nature and extend of Pakistan-US relations. As there are many dynamics in this regard on the regional level in shape of India-Pakistan rivalry, Indo-China, Pakistan-China, central Asian republics and Gulf that determine the true picture of this relationship. Above all, the Afghanistan issue not only influences the future of Afghanistan but also future of Pakistan-US relations along with stability and security of the region.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Lan Talbot, "Prospects for Stability and Democratic Consolidation." ISPI Policy Brief, No. 157, October (2009): 1.

There is no denying the fact only war on terror cannot determine the Pakistan foreign relations in general and the US in particular but now it has become a ground reality. War on terror also defines the broader picture of the region and foreign policy dynamics of the states involved. <sup>10</sup> All the factors like A.Q. Khan Episode, close ties with Afghan Taliban and close strategic alliance with China keep Pakistan on the enemy camp but still it is close ally of west and the US. Weak democracy, vulnerability to religious extremism and weak control of the government in periphery regions has compelled the United States to avoid putting too much stress on it. There has been a consistent support of west and the US for Pakistan to its military governments driven by the threat the nuclear arsenals may not be occupied by the Islamist forces. There have been agreements of cooperation between Pakistan and the US but both the states differed on the interpretation of their obligations. And when such agreements failed that led to the elements of betrayal and suspicion for each other.

In every aspect, India can be a more compatible ally of Washington as compare to Pakistan but the US went for Islamabad due to refusal of India to join western block previously but in the present scenario New Delhi has become point of concern for the US more importantly after the Indo-US Nuclear deal. The US and its western allies give value to political stability of Pakistan but are more tilted towards India because of being major actor in the regional context. Despite Military involvements in the government, Pakistan showed high caliber political consistency and capacity.

Whenever, there was divergence of interests Pakistan tried to pacify the situation and accommodated the US. In this regard, Pakistan always showed moderation and tolerance and never undermines the master goals. It also clearly shows why the US showed tolerance to Pakistan policies when these were not compatible to their interests. A specific relationship established where Pakistan accommodated it on all the critical issues and major goals. In return of which Islamabad was compromised and tolerated on less severe issues despite opposition. The US has strong influence in Pakistan especially after the war on terror when Pakistan became a frontline key ally in it. There have been highs and lows in the mutual relationship of both the states but now it is claimed by the Obama administration that mutual relations have been developed without any coercive means. Pakistan has strong economic ties with the United States

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Benjamin E. Goldsmith, "American Foreign Policy and Global Opinion: Who Supported the War in Afghanistan." The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 49, No. 3, June (2005): 409.

in form of her larger portions of exports along with economic aid. The nature of relationship is almost impossible to analyze the highs and lows between both the allies without taking into account the past history because the policy in the post attacks followed the same line of thinking. Although, in the post terrorist attacks Pakistan-US relations has reviewed as good but certain concerns and limitations are open choices.<sup>11</sup>

The Drone attacks and the US security forces and their contractors are other crucial concerns for Islamabad which help to dictate its foreign and regional policies. Pakistan and China cooperation is mainly due to the perceived common adversary India. China also supported Pakistan help in nuclear arsenal to prepare it as a counterbalance to India and create deterrence. China has been alternative for Pakistan, however; it can be a major cause to destroy the relationship with the United States in the near future. It seems a strong challenge for the US to maintain its relations with Pakistan because of its close ties with China. China's support for Pakistan, Russian factor and Iranian antagonism may not lead the NATO to exert pressure on Islamabad by making US more concerned to Pakistan. However, situation took a dramatic change in 2005 after the Indo-US nuclear deal. It is alarming for Pakistan that it may weakened its deterrence due to their access to the US technology. Behind this deal, superpower has broader designs to prepare India as a counterbalance to emerging China. Pakistan strategy has been complex and more then just an Indian-centric and war on terror that is often perceived by many. Pakistan has diverse relations and regional alliances and if the US wanted to attain its goals then it has to be balanced. Pakistan-US relation seems special but it reflects a combination of complex phenomenon like war on terror, regional alliances, arch rivalry with India and other underlying geo-political realities.

Pakistan's skilled balancing act for its security needs is perceived as a double game by the US and western block. Pakistan wanted to maintain its security by taking part in the new great game despite threats and economic challenges. The Unites States war in Afghanistan with the aim of encircling China may have heavy impacts on Pakistan's foreign and regional relations. Pakistan-US alliance has been strange because both the states have different understanding of their national interests. The United States have been suspicious of the Islamist movements. Afghan war has further aggrandized the mutual tensions by enhancing the threat perceptions and distrust. There lies a great divergence on the issue of national security that there is no chance of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Stephen P. Cohen, the Idea of Pakistan (Washington D.C.: The Brooking Institution, 2011), 5.

compromise on the issue of Afghanistan. This would surely lead both the states to the conflict that can lead to the break up once again. There may be seldom any example of such alliance like Pakistan and the United States partnership that have divergence of interests, threat perceptions and goals but even then repeatedly fall into one alliance. <sup>12</sup>

The leaders of US and Pakistan wanted to ensure the strategic partnership but it has been a default than mutual interests because no one wanted to compromise its national interests. The only reason is that diverging threat perceptions regarding religious ideology is too difficult to overcome. This is a harsh reality that in cliental politics ideological and policy divergence is not considered as much because it's a relationship of give and take, having dependence on each other for the fulfill of the requisite needs. It is the uniqueness of cliental relations that when there is a question of material gains then policy priorities can be changed and ideology is thrown on backburner. Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Unites States are distrusted and conflicting allies. They always wanted to get political advantage over each other and have different strategic goals. The United States attacked on Afghanistan and Pakistan was dragged into the war on terror. Despite of many opposing agendas establishment was left with no option but to join the war on terror for their survival. However, the United States would leave the sooner or the later but if they leave the area before the arrival of security and stability in Afghanistan then it would once again come under the clutches of the chaos and instability by bringing the dire repercussions by arousing the dying issue of Pakhtunistan claim revival, by threatening the territorial integrity of the Pakistan and refugees influx. The presence of Indian forces in Afghanistan is encouraged by the United States and Afghan government and links between Pakistan and Taliban has deepened the trust-deficit between Pakistan and the US relations. Trust- deficit has a long history in Pakistan and the United States relations. Previously, sale of F-16 was suspended due to sanctions and suspicions that such technology might be used by the third party like china which further enhanced the distrust and suspicion between the Islamabad and Washington. Because Washington was annoyed for certain reasons and stopped the economic and military support to Islamabad due to its non-compliance behavior. 13

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>Ijaz Khan, Pakistan's Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy Making: A Case Study of Pakistan's Post 9/11 Afghan Policy Changes (New York: NOVA Science Publishers, 2007), 142.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Graeme P. Herd, ed. *Great Powers and Strategic Stability in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Competing Visions of World Order.* New York: Routledge, 2010: 217.

There is common believe in Pakistan that all the friends, allies and valuable partners are fighting for the same cause that is to make the world a safer place without preconditions. Friendship and partnership cannot flourish under the preconditions. There may be a great impact on Pakistan and the United States relations due to these bargaining's. It would definitely lead to the compromise and dependence with the complete compromise of Pakistan's sovereignty if it continues to go on with the same lines of action. Pakistan has long been submissive to the United State it is interesting to mention here.14 For the first time in the history of both states relations aid is shifting to economic development and civilians well being. It is a welcome step to strengthen the democracy in Pakistan and bring Pakistan out of the clutches of underdevelopment and instability but it is yet to decide whether it is a short term or long term aid programme. In the third phase of their relationship Pakistan supported the United States agenda by becoming a reluctant partner in the war on terror to eradicate the Al-Qaeda but did not ignore their longstanding strategic interests, protection of boarders and territorial integrity. The relationship between Pakistan and the US has been tit-for-tat relationship as both the sides used each other for their respective strategic interests. If the agreements made these were partial agreements not the whole.15

The United States used Pakistan during Afghan war to eradicate Soviets and now in the post 9/11 used it by threatening its existence against the Al-Qaeda and Taliban in return of economic assistance. Partnership gloomed and trust-deficit improved in this regard. There have been 'do more' mantra by the US but Pakistan operations in Swat, Bunir, South Waziristan and other FATA areas has compelled the US policy makers to think that there is a change in Pakistani heart. Kerry-Lugar bill have somewhat improved the situations with few incentives. So, the relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan are improving. However, it would be too early to conclude any thing in this regard because only time will tell that how long this strategic partnership between Pakistan and the United States would go on and at what level this relationship would transform in the post war on terror scenario because of uncertain relationship nature between two partner as evidenced from previous record of their interactions. One reality is quite clear that this strategic partnership is transforming and reaching to the new stages of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>David Sylvan, "Recently Imperial: Assessing Supposed Discontinuities in US Foreign Policy." *Graduate Institute of International Studies*, A Paper Presented at the 45 Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Montreal, March 17-20 (2004): 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Bruce Riedel, *Deadly Embrace*, *Pakistan*, *America and Future of Global Jihad* (Washington: The Brooking Institution, 2011), 24.

cliental politics. However, uncertainties can be removed by thinking in pragmatic way to continue long term strategic partnership. Moreover, growing irritants in terms of state security can lead at the stage of non-cooperation if continued without handling them irrespective of what incentives has been given.

# Statement of the Problem/Rationale of the Study

Foreign policy formulation is always based on certain policy priorities and their national, regional and political outlook. Trust-deficit, interest based cooperation, double standards, event oriented alliances and geo-strategic and geo-political compulsions are the dominating factors of Pakistan-America relations. This relationship is riddled with all these factors where cooperation and non-cooperation goes hand in hand, having the instinct of non-permanence. National interests of Pakistan and the United States dominating the relationship and lacks the sincerity.

Despite ideological and geographical disparities, what are those factors which compel both the states to keep the client-patron relation with each other and continue as strategic allies. Are they pursuing cooperative approach or policies purely based on national interests or both or it is a demonstration of power politics by the pentagon.

# Hypothesis:

Pakistan and the United States partnership is workable despite ideological divergences because politico-security concerns are dominating factors along with their vested economic interests and geo-strategic compulsions at the regional and global level.

# Objective of the Study

- 1- Is Pakistan's Pro-US policy purely a consequence of its security needs?
- 2- What were the factors that shaped Pakistan's decision to form an alliance with the United States in the aftermath of 9/11?
- 3- What are those factors which compels the weaker state to give up certain aspects of its autonomy and become subject to the patron?
- 4- Is there a genuine convergence of interests that drew Pakistan and the United States closer together?

- a. If so, what are the sources of friction that have erupted in Pakistan-America relations in the recent past?
- b. If not, what were the policy priorities that brought the two closer?
- 5- Why US was compelled to make strategic alliance with Pakistan and keep it on the board for future course of actions in the region?
- 6- Client-Patron dependence prevails or national interests overwhelm It.?
  - a. Is Pakistan necessary for the US in the war on terror?
  - b. If yes, why not India?
- 7- Is Pakistan-United States alliance permanent or short-term?
- 8- Is it possible that Pakistan will get US diplomatic and political support for the solution of Kashmir and political backing on other issues?

### Significance of the Study

It is quite significant because Pakistan as a state and South Asia as a region has become focal point for the great powers in the post terrorist attack with the emergence of 21<sup>st</sup> century. This case study explains the realities of post 9/11 scenario when there came a new and devastating challenge encountered the west in general and the United States in particular and brought severe implications for the world community in general and Muslim world in particular. Pakistan came under intense pressure of the United States to join them to combat the menace of terrorism. It is important because South Asia became a battle ground of war on terror and Pakistan's role being a main actor in the region and situated in the neighboring of Afghanistan became crucial. It is pertinent to mention here that this strategic alliance of anti-terrorism once again established strong cliental relation between the United States and Pakistan. The south Asian region has become a point of great concern for the United States not only for terrorism but also for the fulfillment of its global political and economic designs. It is also equally important for other emerging powers as well and so Pakistan is of great significance for regional and global actors. Because any major power would have a superpower status in the coming decades that will have a strong hold on this strategic region of the world.

Pakistan's disputes with India were no doubt central to the Pakistan's foreign policy; however, it would be wrong to examine it too narrowly in this context exclusively of Pakistan's conflicts

with its neighbors. The Quest for security has been at the top of Pakistan's foreign policy agenda so Pakistan has always searched for Alliances. So it is dominantly significant to know that how states seek for alliance for their survival and security which will definitely bring new approaches of international politics in the sphere of foreign policy. Moreover, phenomenon of cliental politics became very relevant because in the contemporary times most of the states are dependent on the strong states for their economic, political and security needs. Changing dynamics of the complex world politics has made it matter of great concerns to understand and analyze the policy priorities and foreign policy making of the world. The most striking feature with the reference of the significance of the study of Foreign policy making that what are those interests which policy makers keep on top most agenda as in the modern times policy making has become very significant phenomenon in this anarchical world of politics and how they maintain their status, pursue national interest and affect the political and diplomatic world accordingly.<sup>16</sup>

Pakistan-US relations have undergone fundamental restructuring. There have been constraints and opportunities for strategic partnership. The Unites States has been apprehensive of many issues regarding Pakistan like Pakistan's unfair role in the war on terror, insecurity of nuclear weapon programme and Pakistan's close ties with Afghanistan due to its geographical proximities. On the other hand, Pakistan has always been suspicious about the Unites States motive as a threat to Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity having close ties with India keeping in mind the past history. So the case study is significant to understand the policy making at state, regional and international level of both the leading countries in international politics in a volatile region of the world.

Furthermore, U.S.A. is sole super power, it is important for its broader strategic designs to keep control on the South Asian region. Pakistan's placement in Asian region and its geo-strategic location make it point of grave concerns for a super power. It has become significant to understand the complex dynamics of politics in the contemporary word. It is pertinent to know in case of Pakistan-United States relations how they are cooperating with each other though on the lowest level despite many differences and disparities. It is necessary to know that either it is Ideology, security, economy, geo-strategic politics, and convergence of interests or other factors

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>Stephen P. Cohen, P. R. Chari and Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (Washington D.C: The Brooking Institute Press, 2007), 190.

which define their foreign policy priorities. It has been explained that by which key factors states foreign polices are determined in the global politics. This reality been analyzed by applying the cliental political theory in the case study of Pakistan-US strategic partnership by keeping in view the dynamics of world politics.<sup>17</sup>

# Methodology

In this study theoretical, explanatory and analytical methods would be used. Collection of the material and relevant data will be from primary and secondary sources of research like books, journals and articles etc. However, some sources of internet have also been used to fulfill the requirements of the case study.

# Clientele Political Theory

Cliental political theory has been analyzed deeply in this case study of Pakistan and the United States relations in post 9/11 phase of world politics. It is very clear in this study that cliental theory is applicable to the bilateral relationship of both the strategic partners. Along with all its essentials this theory is applicable as the relation between both the strategic partners has been transforming and reaching to the new levels of cooperation and partnership. Where the weaker state has some demands and demands are usually opposed while client states may have some objections of the patron policy pursuance. However, both the strategic partners wanted to maintain the strategic relationship despite having disparities on many issues. Cliental theory is a basic theory for this study which is most relevant and qualifies the purpose that both the strategic actors have client-patron relation with each other.

# Organization of Study

Thesis has been divided into five chapters. In the First chapter, theoretical framework has been discussed. It consists of general description, basis, ideal model, phases, dimensions and elements of the cliental theory. It also explains that cliental political theory is applicable in case of Pakistan and United States case study of strategic partnership.

The Second chapter has been divided into six sections and each analyzes the historical dimensions of strategic relations between Pakistan and the United States in different

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Anatol Lieven, "The Pressures on Pakistan." Foreign Affair, Vol. 81, No. 1, February (2002): 107.

phases of time. In the first section, it argues that newly born weak state was in search of the strong partner who could ensure its security vis-à-vis India, economic development and political assistance to ensure its strength against the rival states soon after its birth. While the United States being a key contender of Soviet Union and torch-bearer of capitalism wanted to have client states to make its block strong and for the strengthening of its ideological stance. Second section argues that Pakistan being a dependent state made defense agreements with the western block and the US that seems only compatible at that time to ensure its security needs vis-à-vis India and help in economic development. Pakistan continues to take economic assistance and military support but these pacts were signed to contain Soviet Union rather neutralize India threat to Pakistan. It created trust-deficit and suspicion about the intentions of the United States. Third section focuses on the decade of 70s in which Pakistan realized the motives and goals of its partner and this that they had neither interest in Pakistan security or survival nor sincerity but they pursued their own national strategic interests and used it for the accomplishment of these objectives at the regional and international level. So Pakistan shifted its tilt to other countries and succeeded in establishing close ties with China till the end of that decade and decreased its dependence on west for military assistance at that time. In fourth section it has been argued that after the separation of East Pakistan, Islamabad became isolated and made bilateral ties with the big states. Though, strong relations had developed at bilateral level but Pakistan-US remained intact even at low ebb.

Fifth section describes the revival of Pakistan- US relation when Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979; Pakistan was offered a huge economic and military support by the US to throw out the Soviet Union from the region. Bilateral relations between two states revised again that had reached at the lowest ebb and continued till the disintegration of the Soviet Union in cordial and cooperative way with the development of cliental relations. Sixth section defines post cold war dilemma when Washington had no need of the client state as such so it started showing concerns over their nuclear programme that was put on the backburner till the end of afghan war. Patron as usual took a u-turn and moved to other areas of interests leaving behind partner helpless and putting the client

interests at the backburner that initiated the non-compliance attitude of the Pakistan occasionally in the subsequent years.

Third chapter has been divided into five sections. In the first section ideological perspective has been explained in the eve of communism how ideological perspective dominated the world politics during the cold war and its contribution in the major states policies while interacting with the small states. In the second section of the chapter it has been argued the ideological perspective of Pakistan and the United States whether the ideologies of both the partners differ or merge and what is the level of their ideological affinities. Third section argues that how this strategic alliance is transforming from ideological parity to strategic partnership based on certain key interests in the larger context on the part of both sides. Fourth section argues the basis ideological disparities and clashes between militant factions and imperial power America and its impacts on world peace and politics and how their ideological postures giving sudden momentum to their confrontational behavior in the post 9/11. It also argues that how America is promoting their ideological policy priorities and encountering emerging militancy due to its imperialistic designs. Fifth section explains the ideological divergences between Pakistan and the Unite States in the post 9/11 scenario and role of Pakistan as a frontline state in the war on terror and its ties with Afghanistan.

The Fourth chapter has also been divided into six sections. First section argues that Pakistan-US strategic cooperation in terms of military assistance, arms sale and economic gains dragged Pakistan into the war on terror so this strategic alliance contains a categorical significance. Pakistan aiming to bring peace in the region and make it terrorism free area conducted many operations within its territories as a front-line state in the war on terror. However, the United States never awarded Islamabad with the due reward and continued to demand 'do more' mantra despite the utmost efforts exerted by the Pakistan military. Second section of the chapter discusses the role of security in the client-patron relationship because such collaboration based on mutual security makes a security alliance strong and viable to cooperate on and work out certain policy preferences. So the US priority to combat terrorism is coordinated by Pakistan with full scale cooperation, however, Pakistan security concerns compelling it to join the US-

sponsored war on terror. It has also discussed the security perspectives of Islamabad and Pentagon in the post 9/11 era.

Third section of fifth chapter argues that a major shift appeared in the foreign policy making of the United States as previously it was more concerned to the great powers militaries and heavy industrial complexes while now it is focusing on the rough, underdeveloped states to curb the emerging menace of terrorism that is a real threat to its hegemony and create a sense of fear for it. Fourth section explains the Pakistan-US cooperation in the war on terror in post 9/11 era. It argues that Pakistan became a frontline ally in the US sponsored war on terror and presented all the services in terms military operation and provision of air bases. However, the United States could never get satisfied even after the provision of tangible support offered by the strategic partner but always look it with suspicion and kept on beguiling to do more. It explains that such an attitude of partner discouraged Islamabad sense of cooperation many times and they showed non-compliance behavior on certain events and certain policies of the patron. Fifth section argues that whether aid provided by the United States to Pakistan is really an aid or merely a token money to buy the partner sovereignty to get a specific kind of service after the completion of which there would be neither aid nor support of any other kind. It clearly examines the reality that the relationship is event oriented and trust-deficit in which strong partner deal the weaker according to significance of the event. Sixth section argues the policy divergence of both the partners and security challenges encountering strategic alliance. It also explains the impacts of this strategic partnership on the regional dynamics of powers politics in the post 9/11 era.

The Fifth chapter has also been divided into the Five sections. In the First section it argues that Pakistan's large scale economic and political dependence on the United States make it a client state in the war on terror in post 9/11 phase and it is strengthening the cliental relations. The America provided the economic assistance with continuous intervals to the Pakistan to support their political and strategic interests in the region and war on terror. In second section it explains that Pakistan being a dependant state extended full scale cooperation to get political support of the US to solve the Kashmir issue along with its security and survival. However, this economic lethargy is making Islamabad subordinate to Washington in the twenty century again. Pentagon requires the

cooperation of Islamabad in its competition so Pakistan enlisted and aligned as a front line ally to the United States. In third section it deals with the theoretical assumptions of the political and economic perspectives in the cliental relationship and double standards of the United States in its cliental relations. Section four mainly focuses on the economic dependence on the patron that brings severe implications for the sovereignty of Pakistan. Fifth section of the chapter is concerned to political dimensions of the cliental relationship which discusses the long term strategic designs of the United States in regional context of Asia and concerns of other big actors in the region.

#### CHAPTER ONE

#### Theoretical Framework:

### General Description of the Theory

Clientalism is as an old phenomenon in the history of politics among the states as the subject itself. There is no denying the fact that this theory has always dominated the international politics. Ever since the evolution of world politics there is a natural divide of strong and the weaker so this theory naturally prevails and exist in its essence since the beginning. Discipline of politics is undefined until this relationship is not explained. In international political system stronger states always try to have clientele relations with the weaker, poorly administrated, economically dependent states by controlling all the transactions. Clientele theory has centuries long background behind. The term 'Clientelism' from the Latin word 'Cluere' which means to listen or obey. In ancient Rome a client was a person who had a lawyer speaking for him in trial. In court, this meaning exists still today. At the same time clientele was a group of persons who had someone who speak on their behalf Patronus. The clients were the followers of aristocrats both were related to codes of ethics and morality. Clients were not slave neither bondman but free to stay. They offered work but usually for the political support. Patron uses to give them protection, jobs and even lands to work on it.<sup>18</sup>

The relationship between two states can be described in many ways but most significant understanding of this theoretical framework can be taken by understanding the client-patron relationship. Christopher Carney in 'international client-patron relationship: a conceptual framework' defines three features of Client- Patron Relationship. Comparative politics borrowed the concept of client-patron from anthropological studies and applied it on the states and the regions. Greater the number of clients a patron has, it would have the greater power base. Lord Haswell in 1930 had described this client patron relationship by describing the American party politics and political practices.

Patron provides favor to the clients and in turn clients demonstrate loyalty which made them powerful as compare to other patron states. With reference to the cliental politics, Carl Lande

19 Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>Max Weber, Clientalism: As a Concept (Zurich: Zurich University Press, 1991), 19.

argues that client-patron as a dyadic relationship that shapes most of the political process the domestic as well as international.<sup>20</sup>

#### Basis of Client-Patron Relation:

Cliental relationship is a particular and reciprocal between two actors having unequal economic resources. The relationship is not a zero-sum game by either of the party. Client adheres to the patron not only for its benefit but also due to their sense of affinity and loyalty to the patron. Element of asymmetry is a crucial aspect in the relationship of client and patron. Equalization of resources can break the link of client and patron and decrease its strength while resource disparity can enhance it. Beside, asymmetry and affectivity a client-patron relationship are characterized by reciprocity if either of the party is dissatisfied then they try redress the grievances, altar the existing arrangement or withdraw from it altogether. Voluntary option is another important factor where exit option is always on the same degree on which the relationship was established. Cliental relationship die natural death when sudden clash occur or amidst of conflict. This relationship can evolve as an instrumental leaving other traits of cliency.<sup>21</sup>

Most important aspect of client-patron relationship is compliance behaviour by the client state. A patron always expects compliance from clients on the crucial interests. Patron provides favor in order to get compliance. In reciprocity a patron has to give importance to the client interests and preferences. Client behavior can be existing in a continuum from compliance to no-compliance can fall anywhere in the line depending on the attitude of patron state. The higher the degree of compliance, stronger the relationship of client and patron is. Instances of non-compliance are not necessarily problematic, occur frequently and issue is not crucial to patron interests. The most critical feature of client-patron is compliance of client.<sup>22</sup>

Clientalism stems in psychic thoughts and economic insecurity in which patron help to alleviate it. Adherence to patron can be characterized as a desire to make one's status strong vis-à-vis other weaker states. If benefits exceed for both the parties then entering into client-patron relationship is rational strategy.

<sup>21</sup> lbid.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

Apart from cost-benefit analysis client and patron states share certain commonalities like ideology, culture, religion and historical experience. So a cliental relationship is voluntarily entered, strong dyad have strong element of affectivity. The most important aspect is level of compliance of client with the policies of patron, dyad are mutually beneficial due to their inherent reciprocal nature. Strong compliance indicates strong client-patron relationship.<sup>23</sup>

#### Ideal Model

Bilateral relations between Pakistan and the United States can be defined by number of ways however; the best way to define it is in the concept of client-patron relationship as defined by the Christopher Carnay. Christopher Carnay has defined certain characteristics of this client-patron relationship. A decided asymmetry exists in the military capabilities of the states involved in the relationship. Client plays a significant role in the competition of the patron. Moreover, a very important aspect is the perception of the relationship by the external world. Last but not the least; exit option is another significant factor in patron-cliency relations. Although, dynamics of cliental relations have been defined by many but the phases defined by the Carnay has not been described specifically in this way by any other. Factors like asymmetry in military capability, economic dependence, need for political support and element of compliance make a state client for the patron that gets advantage of the client reciprocally by having compliance, ideological affinity and political support in case of world competition.<sup>24</sup>

#### Phases of Cliental Politics

Cliental relations dimensions have been described by many scholars but the phases of client-patron relationship have not been specifically defined in this way as by the Christopher Carnay. Carney has dominantly focused on the phases of client-patron and defined it in a different way. Carnay has defined client-patron relationship in a unique and pragmatic way that after the establishment of this relation and with the continuous evolving relation which model is applied in their reciprocal relations to describe the nature and stages of relationship. By having all the pre-requisites such unique kind of cooperation is developed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> James C. Scot, "Patron Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1, American Political Science Association (1972): 92.
<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

Carnay in his ideal model has elaborated certain evolution stages of the relationship of dependency. Client-Patron relationship can evolve into one of five arrangements. Progressive decline is such a sitiation in which between patron and client decline with low pace and a time comes when both the states become disinterested in each others relations. Moreover, sudden cessation is a situation in which Any unwanted or problematic event occur which can break the close alliance of patron and client afterwards. With the passage of time, both states get far away. Estrange clientage scenario is also another scenario of cliental politics in which Client and patron maintain the mutual cooperative relationship with each other. Client demand more independence. Client may oppose the patron on certain occasions but the stability of relationship remains a grave concern for both the parties. Cooperation remains functional even at the lowest level. Sometimes, with the change of the status certain policies changes with the changed outlook. In a role reversal like situation, status of client changes to patron and patron to client. It is due to one's downfall and other's progress or the vice versa. It can be temporary situation or can be long term arrangement. Sustainable equality is a situation in which client strengthens or patron weakened or both the situation occurs and results in the balanced equation. In such condition, states would cooperate when it would be mutually beneficial but would not cooperate when there is a point of disagreement between the both parties. Both the parties would have strong relationship overall.<sup>25</sup>

#### **Dimensions of Clientele Politics**

There are certain dimensions of cliental politics which includes the ideological affinity of the client and patron in their strategic partnership. Another significant dimension is making of military alliance in which patron provides the military aids and arms to the client state in return of its services. Economic perspective is also another striking dimension the cliental politics in which clients are provided the economic support by the partner in return of the ideological political support by the client in the world political competition. Along with these three

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>Syed Hussain Shaheed Suharwardy, "An Estranged Client and an Annoyed Patron: Shift in the Pak-US Relations during the 'War on Terror'." *Journal of Political Studies, Vol. 18, issue-2, summer (2011): 58.* 

dimensions diplomatic and socio-cultural cooperation on bilateral level is also significant while interacting bilaterally.<sup>26</sup>

## Dynamics of Estranged Clientage Scenario in Case of Pak-US Cliental Relations

#### **Current Status:**

Pakistan opposing drone attacks constantly so non compliance is clear, it is asserting Pakistan has been asserting more independence of policies on multilateral level so that it could get equal opportunity to establish diplomatic relations with other states. There are many stresses on Pakistan-US strategic partnership bringing the stability of partnership in question. Neither US can assert her dominance completely nor can Pakistan be fully independent in its policy making. The relationship is in transitional phase between complete independence and complete dominance and this transitional stage is estranged clientage<sup>27</sup>

## The Client-Patron Concept Applied to Interstate Relations

There exist a clear cut asymmetry in military capabilities of the client and patron along with unequal economic resources hold by the both partners. Client play important role in patron's competition in the external. It can be in terms of ideological, political and real terms for the support of the patron. Sometimes, client by getting annoyed of the patron's policies shows non-compliance behavior. In cliental relationship, patron ignores the non-compliance on the less severe issues but not on the important strategic issues. Moreover, when a client-patron relationship is established strongly then it perceived by the external world as deterrent because it is made for the enhancement of security on bilateral level. There is shown a deceptive solidarity by the patron with the client by declaring itself the guarantor of the security of the client and transfer arms to it as military aid. The relations between client and patron remain event-oriented and task-specific in which patron controls the primary concerns of its partner. However, repeated non-compliance weakened the cliental relation and results in the breakup of the partnership. In such case

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> ibid

patron uses economic, military and diplomatic pressure the partner to be compliant. However, complete compliance means loss of the autonomy and sovereignty of the client.

#### Benefits to Clients:

Client is in no-win situation vis-à-vis patron policies because patron pursues its own policies based on its vested interests. Clients response always based on certain costs associated with. If there is strong security concern is involved then it will lead client to be compliant actor in the mutual interactions. From the interstate perspective, clients want to enhance their position relative to other nation states like as evidenced from Pakistan-America, Unites States-South Korea relations etc. In each of the case lesser partner always try to improve its status relative to other regional states and enhances its prestige. For the pursuance of its policies client find an ally in the harsh and unfavorable environment by establishing close ties with it at the regional and global arena. The client state shows compliant behavior in order to get economic support of the patron for her stability because relative economic stability can outweigh the cost reduced autonomy. Military equipment and training facilities are acquired from the strategic partner while diplomatic support which can enhance the credibility of the client.<sup>28</sup>

#### Benefits to the Patron

#### Goals of Patron:

Patron state always wanted ideological convergence of the client state. It expects client's state to support and help in proliferation of her ideological objectives and goals. Stronger states wanted peace and security and international solidarity. However, major objective of the patron is strategic advantage vis-à-vis other emerging big powers.

Unites States has a long tradition of linking ideology to foreign policy. Patron seeks to influence and control the client and in exchange of material goods patron expects intangible goods. Client assists to attain the desired goals of the patron at the regional and global level. The patron always wanted the promotion of her ideology by the client states

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>Lene Remarchand and Keith Legg, "Political Clientalsim and Development: A Preliminary Analysis." *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (1972): 155.

on the international level. Patron can also assist her client state to refine the government only if it is against the interests of patron state. Moreover, Solidarity by the client is defined by treaty obligation, visits by head of states, convergence of United Nations voting, pronouncement of client support to patron. If client's loyalty is not in question in crucial issues, client is given more autonomy on less critical issues. Patron through the client control territory, resources and strategic space get advantage over principal adversary. Patron uses client in as a surrogate in regional issues instead of direct confrontation with the primary adversary. Patron may keep the military presence in the client's territory to minimize the influence of adversary and create deterrence stability. Patron does not interference in the domestic politics but only in those which are against her strategic goals. So, advantage gained by the patron through client defines client's value to the patron<sup>29</sup>

### Patron-Client Elements at Interstate level

There are certain elements that exist between client and patron relationship at interstate level. There exist asymmetry in terms of military capability that usually existed between superpower and less developed country or economic giant power of superpower and poverty in less developed country. There also exists a mutual cooperation because patron supports in terms of military and economic support in return for policy convergence from the client. In the element of affectivity, patron shares ideological affinity with the client having same adversary in this regard. Compliance behavior is significant factor in which patron takes political and diplomatic support of the client state in terms of United Nations voting on the issue that is a key to the patron interests and strategic goals, hostile policies towards the potential adversary and reduction of human right violation by the client.<sup>30</sup> With the establishment of this theoretical framework it is possible to apply it on the case of Pakistan and the US relations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup>Christopher P. Carney, "International Patron-Client Relationship: A Conceptual Framework." *Comparative International Development Studies, summer, No. 2* (1989): 46-49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>Kitschelt Herbert Wilkinson, ed. *Patrons*, *Clients*, and *Policies*. *Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010: 17.

# Applicability of Clientele Politics Attributes in Pakistan-US Case Study

Pakistan and the United states had certain diplomatic exchanges at the initial stage but later on, developed cliental relationship by having all these three attributes. There was a clear asymmetry of military capability existed between Pakistan and United States. Pakistan was dependent on the US for their defense threats from outside world like India and Soviet Union. During cold war era, Pakistan being weaker state like many states was used by the US when both big powers were in search of clientage in the region. Pakistan took the side of capitalists by denying the invitation of Soviets because of having sense of insecurity from them.

As the theoretical framework has been established and it is more like to be applicable in case of Pakistan and United States relationship. In the past both the states have had a strong cliental relationship from the very start of their mutual relations till the end of the cold war era. However, now it seems after the occurrence of certain milestones in the arena of world politics that relationship between Pakistan and the United States has taken new dynamics and paradigms after the end of cold war and especially after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The patterns of Cliental relations between Pakistan and the US are transforming and reaching to the new levels of cooperation and new dynamics of partnership.

Dynamics of Relationship between Pakistan and the US after terrorist attacks are very unique in nature accompanying with many U-turn policies on the part of the both the states. Pakistan having the client status is reaching to the next level of cliental relationship where they demand more independence in their actions. Even Islamabad is pursuing her many independent policies towards many states. On many occasions, relations between both the states reached to the hearting stalemate but pacified by showing of flexibility on the part of client or the patron. Pakistan is cooperating on this combat on terrorism ever since the beginning of war on terror (WOT). Both the United States and Pakistan many times reached to the points of non-cooperation and non-agreement but pacified the situation diplomatically as both the states wanted to maintain and stabilize their relationship by perceiving it as a matter of grave concern. So, the United States also gave weightage to Pakistan due to its strategic location having corridors of entrance in the all four regions and could be beneficial to contain the communist block. It significantly, defines the second attribute of the client-patron Relationship. Client-patron relationship between Islamabad and Washington was very visible during the cold war era particularly on Afghan war and observed by the external world that definitely justifies the third

assumption. Element of exit is also another main factor of the client-Patron relationship. If a relationship made voluntarily it can also be left in the same way. A client- patron relationship can end due to the conflict or when the expectations remain unmet.

Pakistan's disputes with India are no doubt central to the Pakistan's foreign policy making however, it would be wrong to take it too narrowly in the context exclusively of Pakistan's conflicts with its neighbors. Quest for security has always been at the top of the Pakistan's foreign policy making agenda, so that Pakistan has always been in search of Alliances. So it has dominantly significant that how states go for alliance for their survival and security which will definitely bring new approaches of international politics in the sphere of foreign policy.<sup>31</sup>

#### Literature Review

Howard B. Schaffer and Teresita C. Schaffer in 'how Pakistan negotiates with the United States: riding the roller coaster,' explains the decision making in Pakistan and its overall foreign policy towards America. It guides the policy makers of America to keep other factors in mind like culture while dealing with Pakistan. Author has touched the key elements of Pakistani society to understand the problem. They talk about the sensitivities involved in negotiating with each other in historical perspective. The writers opine that Pakistan's basic foreign policy priorities have been stable since its independence towards the United States in broader perspective.

Pakistan's foreign policy makers have been trying to be reliable partners of America in the outside world. The writer also gives thought that role of the United States in the Pakistan-India conflict has been biased because its side tilted towards India that's why it never played the role to manage the crises between Pakistan and India. This book mainly focuses on the insights of future American negotiations when both the states are engaged in the war on terror and where irritants exist between the two states.<sup>32</sup>

A.Z. Hilali in 'US Pakistan Relations', focuses that for the first time Pakistan got involved as a front line state as a result of soviet invasion on Afghanistan. Soviet invasion was a matter of concern, anxiety and worrisome for the entire world which directly threatened the peace, security

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup>Syed Hussain Shaheed Suharwardy, "An Estranged Client and an Annoyed Patron: Shift in the Pak-US Relations during the 'War on Terror'." *Journal of Political Studies, Vol. 18, issue-2, summer, (2011): 71.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup>Howard B. Schaffer and Teresita C. Schaffer. *How Pakistan Negotiates with the United States: Riding the Roller Coaster.* (Islamabad: Vanguard, 2011), 199.

and stability of the world at large. This event brought more concerns in terms of security and stability for Pakistan more than any other state of South Asia and had to fight on two fronts. The world had witnessed Pakistan-US strong partnership against the soviet invasion in 1979. New era of Pakistan- US strategic partnership started after 9/11 terrorist attacks. It is very clear from the fact that Pakistan aligned itself with the US to get economic assistance, the US arms as well as protection against the perceived threat form Kabul and Moscow-Delhi nexus.<sup>33</sup> Both the states are far from each other having no similarity, different in their ways of life and lacking in socioeconomic similarities worked together on many occasion to ensure peace and security of the world. Another very important factor is that the US looks this partnership from the lenses of global perspective while Pakistan sees from the regional perspective and for its security, stability and economic development.

The author has briefly described the trends of relationship between the United States and Pakistan by discussing the event-wise policy priorities on both the ends but failed to cover all the strategic aspects of partnership. Era of cold war, end of cold war has been defined as turning points in the foreign policy of the US Towards Pakistan however, author missed the September 11 attacks that brought drastic changes in foreign policy postures of the US and Pakistan and changed the picture of regional and global outlook of both the countries due to strategic compulsions.

Many factors which brought policy shift in Pakistan foreign policy inline with the US expectations. Author has given a brief summary of relationship between both the states in mutual interactions but did not describe the reasons responsible for the sustenance of this strategic partnership. However, nature and type of relationship which remained a crucial point in case of Pakistan and the US strategic partnership has not been clearly defined. Although, author has focused on security and stability with regard to India has been discussed but didn't mentioned the intensity of threat to Pakistan by the US to its very existence soon after terrorist attacks if the policy could not be in line with the US that is essential for this relationship. Another major area of concern in the context of Pakistan and the US strategic partnership lapsed by the author is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup>A. Z. Hilali, US Pakistan Relationship (United States: Aghast Publishing Company, 2005), 69.

related to the future of this strategic alliance either it would remain intact or come to an end. Permanence or non-permanence of partnership can define its durability.<sup>34</sup>

In the edited book, 'Pakistan beyond the crises state,' by Maleeha Lodhi has explained that Pakistan is a weak state with strong society and the deteriorating situation can be improved if the impetus comes from within the state apparatus. This collection by writer has addressed the issues of security, economics, governance, politics and foreign policy. The writer mainly left the idea that poor leadership is liable for country's underdevelopment and lack of progress. She believes that most of the problems in Pakistan are due to the external factors inefficiency at the national level ruling. The regional issues and their spill over effects have worsened the situation. More importantly, she mentions the geo-strategic location more of a challenge rather asset. The country need urgent solutions too many problems that look mismanaged in the short time. The main point has been about the leadership failure that leads to the poor situation of the country.<sup>35</sup>

Rajshree Jetly in 'Pakistan in the regional and global politics,' describes that Pakistan and the US alliance is now in a serious crises scenario. Pakistan is badly in need of durable foundation that could consolidates its position and stabilize it to make it a secure and responsible actor in the world politics. It requires institutionalized process of change and development along with publically mandated governments without the military involvement as a real actor. A great responsibility lies on the United States and its allies. Instead of manipulating Pakistan for their short term goals they need to develop a long term strategy to involve Pakistan as a real participatory for a longer period of time. Obviously, it is in no one interest to see the nuclear Pakistan as a weaker state or disintegrated state that may bring far-reaching effects on the world politics. Pakistan became a Non-NATO ally for the United States in the war against terror and a base for military operations and intelligence. Pakistan not only accepted her role as a frontline state but has also tried to prove that it is a moderate state. Secondly, Pakistan also assured the US about its nuclear programme. It also took economic and military assistance in return of her role in the war on terror.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid

<sup>35</sup> Maleeha Lodhi, ed. Pakistan: Beyond the Crises State. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2011: 378.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup>Jetly Rajshree, ed. *Pakistan in the Regional and Global Politics*. London: Rutledge Taylor and Francis group, 2009: 37.

Author has explained about the domestic stability of Pakistan that could be beneficial for the US. Democratic government can bring change and analyzed the strategies of the US after 9/11 attacks. Furthermore, he has given descriptive overview of the Pakisan-US relations. In this book many questions remained unaddressed. Author has left many areas of concern unaddressed. Factors that compelled the Pakistan to get into involved in the war on terror have not been discussed. Neither has he touched the new emerging phenomenon of regionalism that can alter the existing trends of relations nor the policy priorities. Author has also discussed the domestic politics and its effects on policies however; he has not touched the trends of foreign policy and relationship that has developed.<sup>37</sup> Author has defined that internal stability and mature democracy can strengthen the image of Pakistan in the outside world and enable it to make strong strategic ties with external world however, has not defined the out-side in explanation that refers to the international system that effects state policy in new world dynamics. Author says that the US wanted to keep Pakistan on board and don't want to leave it in isolation. However, it is contrary to Pakistan-US partnership history as the US pursues realist policies and national interests and having no concerns with the stability of client states.

Bruce Riedel in 'deadly embrace, Pakistan-America, and the future of global jihad' has elaborated the highly negative role of the United States in the domestic political context of Pakistan. This explains the imperial role in a negative way that they have endorsed all the dictators' rule in Pakistan.

According to him the US is responsible for the poor record of democracy in Pakistan. Most important part has been described by the writer is about the future of relationship between two countries. Riedel perceive the 'Deadly embrace' is a result of ill-conceived policies of the United States. The writer has categorized the Kashmir problem as a very important for Pakistan and the importance of the US for Pakistan economic market as well. But if the US does not change its approach and outlook towards Pakistan their bilateral partnership would become history in future.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup>Bruce Riedel, *Deadly Embrace-Pakistan*, *America*, *and the Future of Global Jihad* (Washington, D.C.: Brooking Institution press, 2011), 180.

Irfan Hussain in 'fatal faultlines: Pakistan, Islam and the West' states that the United States foreign policy is based upon geo-politics and economics. They intervene in other countries for the greater cause of human beings. It is difficult for them to understand that why Muslims are against Zionism and occupation of Palestine. The author has categorically dealt with the reason why most of Pakistani are anti-American. On one hand, the country produces open-minded, scholar that compete the rest of the world while on the other hand there are fundamentalist that have a specific ideology and pattern of thinking. Pakistan is in a state of denial. There is American perception that Pakistan is not fully cooperating in the war on terror and playing double game. Though the writer is western bent but here in this book he has tried to balance the approach and thinking, however, the book is very informative and thoughtful to understand the mentality of Pakistan and western policy makers.<sup>39</sup>

Usama Butt and Julian Schofield in 'Pakistan: the US, Geopolitics and grand strategies' has analysed the future of Pakistan's foreign policy and special relationship between Pakistan and the US. The writer mainly discusses that Pakistan's foreign policy is not determined by the requirements of the US led war on terror or Indian approach alone but many other factors like internal sensitivities and relations with the regional allies and non-allies also influence it. The Writer also explains that Pakistan's policy is followed by its national interests. It also discusses the Islamic orientation of the state and Islamic reaction of the masses as with the US and other regional countries has been weakened due to the weaker Islamic orientation Pakistan relations. Shamshad Ahmed khan explains that the relationship between Pakistan and the United States would go beyond the war on terror and will focus on the people of Pakistan.<sup>40</sup>

Mazhar Saleem and Mussarat Jabeen in, 'post 9/11 globe' explain that the September 11 terrorist attacks and global war on terror has drawn the global focus on Pakistan as a pivotal state in the region. Pakistan came under intense American pressure to join the US-led war on terror. Pakistan Joining of war on terror for economic assistance has complicated badly the internal and regional security environment of the country. Despite many challenges Musharraf government joined being on the right side. After joining the war on terror Pakistan clearly distinguished the terrorists and freedom fighters by drawing the attention of the global world to curb the root

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Irfan Hussain, Fatal Faultlines: Pakistan, Islam and the West (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2012), 218.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Usama Butt and Julian Schofield, eds. Pakistan: the US, Geopolitics and Grand Strategies. London: Pluto Press, 2012: 272.

causes of the terrorism. However, Pakistan cleared the US not to use them as an instrument just like once against communism and now against terrorism but see it in the larger perspective.

Relations between the weak and stronger power always remain strained due to their perception and policies. A great power always makes a policy on global parameter while the weaker state thinks on the regional level. The US has relationship of close ally with Pakistan in the war on terror one thing which kept them closer is their combined motives. Pakistan interests in a regional balance of power have converged with the US global interests. FATA has intensified US dependence on the Pakistan and both states are on peak of convergence of interests. Pakistan being a weaker partner remains loyal to the US while strong partner fulfill weaker partner demands regarding local and regional needs. However, history teaches that great power never sacrifice their vested interests. Author has explained the challenges that Pakistan faced in the wake of 9/11 attacks. He is of the view that Pakistan joins the war on terror for economic assistance but did not mention the economic, military, political losses that Pakistan suffered in the war on terror. Author has defined that during war on terror Pakistan categorically distinguished the terrorists with freedom fighter. But he has ignored the reality that their stance got minimum significance and jeopardized the future of freedom movement.

The US gives conditional economic support to Pakistan for operation in Swat and Waziristan but this area has been overlooked by the author that it would minimize the autonomy of the state and would not be able to establish a permanent partnership. It definitely opens it for many research questions.

In, 'United States new approach and challenges for Pakistan' it has been mentioned that the dynamics of the US policy for South and West Asia particularly Afghanistan is effecting Pakistan in one way or the other. Tragic events of terrorist attacks have changed the outlook of the region on regional and global level where the US is committed to eradicate the terrorism, extremism and other related phenomenon. Is seems the only reason that role of the regional powers in this part of the region has enhances or increased to a great extent. It is high time when Pakistan has to make its future course of action in a very calculated way to stabilize its regional

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup>Muhammad Mazhar Saleem, Mussarat Jabeen, and Naheed S. Goraya, eds. *Post 9/11 Globe*. Lahore: Center for South Asian Studies, University of Punjab, 2010: 163.

and global interests. Re-orientation of the policies by keeping in mind the ground realities along with the national interests can lead to the respectable survival of Pakistan in the eyes of world over. To this regard, it is essential to make a strategy that would be beneficial for the peace and prosperity of the region ultimately. An unfolding scenario is introducing a challenging environment and bringing Pakistan into a complex and decisive situation. Despite many hurdles, Pakistan is compelled to harmonize her interest Vis-a- Vis rest of the world.

Foreign policy formulations need a rational and analytical outlook. Post 9/11 environment has also provided Pakistan an opportunity to revisits her national and regional interests. Policy is crystal clear on their part; the US wants to meet the challenges by putting all the elements of international power. For that purpose, the US is keeping all the regional countries on board and above all Pakistan to meet all the challenges of terrorism and others. Author has given a very brief overview about the complex situation that emerged after the terrorists attack as Pakistan came under immense pressure to clear her posture in this regard. Moreover, Afghan attack by the US made the strategic environment tough and stiffer for the regional powers. Pakistan came under the limelight of the global powers which has defined its posture by securing her security and stability of the region. Author has not discussed that whether it was an independent decision or imposed. Whether Pakistan willingly decided to join war on terror or compelled to do so. Author didn't define the point that why India was not asked to fight in the war on terror like Pakistan.

Ahmed Rashid in, 'Decent into Chaos, the worlds most unstable region and threat to global security' discusses that in the post September 11 era, Pakistan has undergone through a tough and complicated phase. It was very difficult for Pakistan to leave the Four decade old ongoing policy after the terrorist attacks. By joining war on terror and giving up the previous policies has brought far reaching effects on her security and stability due to being under constant threat of suicide bombing. The US joined hands with general Musharraf instead of Pakistani people and democratic process that created a lot of hatred for the United States. Pakistan being a base area

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> "Unites States New Approach and Challenges for Pakistan," *Center for Policy and Media Studies* (CPMS), April (2010), 13.

needed help for the state stability in the larger interest of regional stability.<sup>44</sup> The U-turn in Pakistan policy should not perceived as a long-term strategy but mere a tactical move to appease the United States and to balance the Indian hegemony. Foreign policy of Pakistan towards the US has been mainly basing on certain points in return for alliance in the war on terror. Security of Pakistan has been kept on top priority in this realm along with the issue of Kashmir. A friendly government in Kabul has also been the part of the Pakistan foreign policy. The United States on the other hand also set certain policies in this regard by acknowledging the strategic importance of Pakistan with the reality that it is impossible to win the war on terror without help of Pakistan. Moreover, intelligence sharing can be proved a key in operationalization of war in the pursuit of Al-Qaeda members. Pakistan nuclear weapon security and internal stability has been constant point of concerns for the United States. It is also a ground reality on the part of the US that they never become satisfied with the role of Pakistan in the war on terror. 45 Author has elaborated that it was difficult for Pakistan to leave previous foreign policy and join hands with the United States. He tells that the US joined hands with Musharraf that created hatred amongst the people of Pakistan for Parvez Musharraf. However, he does not explore the reason that Musharraf was not the cause but it was due to the US policies like drone attacks and killing of innocent people that created hatred amongst the common peoples.

Author has not defined the implications of Indian factor in the Afghanistan that can change the attitude towards the US by bringing crucial effects. As it may provoke Pakistan and may cause policy shift.<sup>46</sup>

Zahid Hussain, in, 'Frontline Pakistan', elaborated the Dramatic events of 9/11 pushed Pakistan into a new spotlight. After remaining isolated due to its longstanding support for Taliban and cross-boarder insurgency in Kashmir, it became key strategic partner of America. Military junta which had supported the proxy war in Afghanistan now joined hands with the US against the terrorism. Adjoining areas of Pakistan with Afghanistan became the battleground for the war on terror where a large amount of military struck in that mountainous region. Author has described

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup>Ahmed Rashid, *Decent into Chaos*, the World's most Unstable Region and Threat to Global Security (London: Penguin Books, 2008), 182.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Zahid Hussain, Frontline Pakistan (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 144.

the Musharraf decision to join war on terror as a momentous decision. He actively sponsored the US-led war on terror in Afghanistan and his policy to support Taliban exposed. However, author ignored the reality that Pakistan never allowed the US to launch attacks from their territory. Pakistan refused not to let them break their sovereignty. Pakistan took certain steps not to appease the US but actually their security and stability that were felt by superpower.

Author was unable to define that after these terrible attacks Pakistan took a u-turn from East to West that caused severe damage to it's vary outlook in the eyes of Muslim world. Another black spot on Pakistan dignity as a nation was illegal sale of the nuclear material which intensified during the US confrontation with Iran on the issue. Musharraf support for US-led war on terror, tactical support for certain militant groups and opposition to democracy and accountability has intensified the social, cultural, ethnic and religious divides in society of Pakistan. Author mainly explained that after joining war on terror and Musharraf decisions in this regard, the role of military and inter-services intelligence in Afghanistan, Kashmir and at the domestic level of Pakistan has been established.

Although author has not touched the core area of foreign policy dynamics between Pakistan and the US by ignoring the main point of concern for research that what kind of relationship established between both strategic allies after the terrorist attacks in the war on terror. Internal domestic political challenges and role of establishment has been portrayed but not the challenges which Pakistan faces from outer world especially the US.<sup>49</sup>

### Findings of Literature Review

Pakistan's foreign policy makers have been trying to be reliable partners of America in the outside world. The role of the United States in the Pakistan-India conflict has been biased because its side tilted towards India that's why it never played the role to manage the crises between Pakistan and India. Pakistan can be most effective in the future American negotiations with the Taliban when both the states are engaged in the war on terror and where irritants exist between the two states. The United States and Pakistan both the states are far from each other, having no similarity, different in their ways of life

49 Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> Zahid Hussain, Frontline Pakistan (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 199.

and lacking similarities in socio-economic spheres. The United States look this partnership from the lenses of global perspective while Pakistan sees from the regional perspective particularly for its security, stability and economic development. Event-wise policy priorities on both the ends have been discussed but failed to cover all the strategic aspects of partnership. Era of cold war, end of cold war has been defined as turning points in the foreign policy of the United States Towards Pakistan.

It has focused on security and stability with regard to India but didn't mentioned the intensity of threat to Pakistan by the United States to its very existence soon after terrorist attacks if the policy could not be in line with the US that is essential for this relationship. Most of the problems in Pakistan are due to the external factors and inefficiency at the national level ruling while the regional issues and their spillover effects have worsened the situation. The geo-strategic location of Pakistan has become a challenge rather than asset.

Internal stability and mature democracy can strengthen the image of Pakistan in the outside world and enable it to make strong strategic ties with external world. In Pakistan-US partnership history the United States follows the realist policies and national interests and having no concerns with the stability of client states. Pakistan's foreign policy is not determined by the requirements of the US led war on terror or Indian approach alone but many other factors like internal sensitivities and relations with the regional allies and non-allies also influence it. The Islamic orientation of the state and Islamic reaction of the masses as with the US and other regional countries has been weakened due to the weaker Islamic orientation of Pakistan relations. Pakistan Joining of war on terror for economic assistance has complicated badly the internal and regional security environment of the country. Pakistan joined the war on terror for economic assistance but did not mention the economic, military, political losses that Pakistan suffered in the war on terror.

The United States policies like drone attacks and killing of innocent people creating hatred amongst the common peoples. Pakistan has been lacking the charismatic leadership that could stabilize it internally and strengthen its say in international affairs with viable policy priorities. Domestic political stability can be beneficial for the Pakistan as it could bring change at the regional level. Internal stability and mature democracy can strengthen the image of Pakistan in the outside world and enable to make strong strategic

ties with external world. The relationship between Pakistan and United States would go beyond the war on terror and focus on the people of Pakistan. Pakistan actively supported the US-led war on terror in Afghanistan and its policy to support Taliban exposed.

### CHAPTER TWO

# Historical Background of Pakistan and United States Relations 1947-2000

This chapter discusses the historical perspective of strategic partnership between Pakistan and the US from 1947 to the 2000. It argues that relations between two strategic allies have been fluctuating from contradiction to cooperation, divergence to convergence and varied from case to case in their bilateral relations. Trust-deficit and suspicion about each other motives lead both the partners' relationship to lack of consistency and endurance. It is surprising to observe in case of Pakistan-US relations that despite of many divergent goals, different motive and policies this relationship never ended and remained intact at least at the lowest working level. It further argues that though Islamabad wanted to have cordial relations with all states whether it was Soviet Union or the US but its leaders having pro-western orientation led it to make alliance with western block. Second factor was its security needs that could only be fulfilled by the western powers. Islamabad had developed friendly relations with the United States at the initial stage that prevented Pakistan align with Communist block.

A gap was created many times but never led so far away that could never resume their relationship. This created a big space between policy priorities of the allies and they could never establish a cordial and fair relationship. This relationship nature provided an image of the Washington designs and goals that's why Islamabad diverted to other big powers by decreasing the dependence on it for economic and military assistance that annoyed the patron. But relationship was strategic, short term and event oriented and continued to remain intact even at the lowest ebb. This exactly describes the spirit of the weaker state dependence on the superior partner at interstate level.

Pakistan relations with the United States have been both conflicting and cooperative ranging from indifference to hostility. In the recent times these relations once again have become cordial between the two states but the checkered history has inherent contradiction and different posture on policy matters between Islamabad and Washington. Pakistan's partnership with the US has been one of the fundamentals of its foreign policy but the US treated it in a subordinate way as a weak and dependent state. The geo-political realities and strategic compulsion compel the both states to go for alliance while the differences over the regional and international level lead them

far away. Different socio-economic and political structure prevented both the states to develop permanent and cordial relationship. It is surprising that despite many constrains and limitation the relationship between the two states survived even in the worst times both the states managed to maintain it at least working level that proves the vary existence of cliental relationship between both the Pakistan and the US. Character of Islamabad being a dependent state made this cliental relation strong and maintained it at lowest level in the previous decades despite clashes and divergences on many events and on many occasions.<sup>50</sup>

However, the US as a patron state has remained close to Pakistan for her economic, geostrategic and political interest rather bilateral ties with the regional actors including Islamabad. Its policy towards region has been to safeguard its objectives and dominated due to the policy of containment of the Soviet and the China. Moreover, her policy has never been consistent to the states involved rather than vested interests of her own. It was perceived that economic development and technical assistance would be enhanced for the political stability and resistance for the communist influence and penetration at the regional level. Communism had started to penetrate in many countries after its success in China and North Korea. Now America feared that communism was on the march to the South Asia. Initially, the US did not realize the geostrategic importance of Pakistan. Pakistan is located in geo-strategic location of this volatile region having both opportunities and challenges.<sup>51</sup>

## Cordial Relations and Search for the Security Alliance 1947-53

Major concerns of Pakistan since its inception are security, integrity and sovereignty while making relations with the United States and other states. Pakistan established very strong relations with the United States soon after its independence by not giving the same weightage to the Soviet Union's offer. At the initial stage Soviet government invited Pakistan Prime minister and invitation was accepted but could not materialize because Liaqat Ali Khan Visited the United States instead of Soviet Union. This move of Pakistani government annoyed the Soviet Union. Pakistan's alignment with the western camp proved to be harmful to Pakistan-Soviet relations. However, military assistance provided by the US created an element of deterrence for

M. Raziullah Azmi, Pakistan American Relations: The Recent Past (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1994), 62.
Shirin R.Tahir-Khel, India, Pakistan, and the United States: Breaking with the Past (Islamabad: Vanguard Books, 1998), 35.

the Pakistan security and survival vis-à-vis India. Pakistan got aligned and received assistance in terms of economy and military as a consideration to ban the communist parties and suppress all the communist activities with an iron hand.

Pakistan's policy of anti-Communism declared it as anti-communism state by getting the strong support from extremist right wing parties and American associations. Another significant factor of this alignment was that with the western assistance military-bureaucratic elite strengthened at the expense of political elite. This development left strong signs on the internal political system of Pakistan. Obviously, it brought severe implications for the state in the subsequent years the effects of which are still visible.<sup>52</sup>

The entire assistance programme which came to Pakistan was spent on the western part of Pakistan because of its close proximity with the Soviet Union. So internal stains increased which ultimately led the country towards destabilization.<sup>53</sup>

Early phase of Pakistan foreign policy does not explain that it is ant-Communist state rather tried to have good relations with all the states. During the initial years of its independence, Pakistan pursued a policy of neutrality but when Indian hostility came across on the issue of Kashmir and on other bilateral strategic issues. Pakistan aligned itself with the west block especially the US. Answer for this alignment lies in the issues of security, economy and political instability at that time. Pakistan was suffering for her security, economic and political needs like all other new born states.

These security issues could not allow the state to maintain her policy of neutrality so, Pakistan had very conducive environment in South Asia for the US to make an ally in the region for their broader designs. Pakistan was the only US ally from South Asia at the initial stage. Its intimacy can judged from the fact that it came to be known as most allied ally of the United States in Asia. Pakistan and the US came to an alliance with almost divergent motives. Pakistan with the motive to contain Indian threats and economic and political problems while the US for the containment of the Soviet Union. In this way both the states formed a cliental relationship. The elite of

<sup>52</sup> ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> Mahboob A. Popatia, Pakistan's Relations with the Soviet Union 1947-79 (Karachi, Pakistan Study Center, 1988), 11.

Pakistan at that time were almost pro-west but felt not threat either from the Soviet Union and China.

During the signing of SEATO Pakistan tried hard to define the aggression in boarder spectrum but the US remained stick to the communist aggression. All the pacts signed with the patron were Soviet specific rather India however, despite knowing the divergences of their perceptions and policies of both the states decided to continue the alliance anyway. Alliance proved beneficial for the short time and Pakistan got economic and military assistance. So it is obvious from the fact that foundation of the cliental relation between both the states laid down after signing these defense pacts in the case study of Pakistan and American relations.

## Economic and Military Aid: A Price for Loyalty 1953-62

In this phase, Pakistan foreign policy turned from an independent to alignment policy with the west for its security quest. Due to certain security challenges at the regional level Pakistan aligned her with west and signed number of pacts with the United States for the security and economic assistance which kept Pakistan trapped in the cold war. Pakistan mainly entered with the US as close ally by having defense pacts for its security and survival need due to Indian and Afghan factor. Moreover, Pakistan economic deterioration also compelled it to get closer to the US. America also came to rescue Pakistan when there was shortage of wheat. It showed an element of goodwill gesture at that time. Another factor that led Pakistan to have good relations with the US was its sense of isolation and insecurity as a new borne state. It was perceived by Pakistan that United Nation would not facilitate to solve the issue with India especially the Kashmir issue because it was dominated by the western powers in general and United States in particular. So in the shape of the US it was a viable option to make a strong alliance.

To choose the United States was not surprising because Pakistani leaders had shown enough intention to join US block. America extended economic support for Pakistan for its global strategy to contain communism. Military top-brass played strong role to have cordial relations with the United States because they think that west was more sophisticated in economic and technical field and sufficient resources to support its allies. In 1954 Pakistan signed defense assistance agreement with the United States to get military assistance. However, it was not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup>I.A. Rehman, *Pakistan Under Siege* (Lahore: Rohtas Publisher, 1990), 144.

allowed to use that assistance for the purpose of aggression against any other nation except in matter that was described in the United Nations. This assistance was provided purely for the enhancement of security of the Pakistan and no any other purpose. Pakistan also joined SEATO Pact that would assure the collective self-defense and an attack on one state would be considered on all. Although, Pakistan took a plea to include all kinds of aggression in it, however, it was rejected and categorically defined against the communist aggression not against India. 55

Pakistan joined SENTO in 1955 and its importance for it was membership of three Muslim states. It was also related to the security and defense. The United States defined this pact against the Soviet Union and not to be used in intra state issues. <sup>56</sup> Due to its geo-strategic location Pakistan earned multi million dollars by joining the western block that improved the economic and defense capabilities of Pakistan. All of these agreements were for the containment of Communism and not for the regional issues. Pakistan got economic and military support and reciprocated and compromised her sovereignty by providing air base near Peshawar for almost a decade. This move was perceived as hostile by the Indians and the Soviet Union.

Pakistan got struck in the cold war without the realization of policy goals like balance of power for the insecurity. Pakistan moved to the west for her insecurity, suspicion and arm race in the region. However, the US lost her credibility as a patron when its role got suspicious in term of conflicts with India. It is true that alignment with the western block was also very costly for Pakistan. It not only compromised her sovereign foreign policy but missed the chance to revise her relations with the Soviet Union. They not only threatened Pakistan for dire consequences if they allowed their territory to be used against the Soviet Union but also strongly criticized Pakistan's close ties with western block more significantly with United States.

In revenge of this alliance, the Soviet Union supported the stance of India over occupied Kashmir and Afghan territorial claims. Although, US realizes the security sensitivities of Pakistan but they never extended enough diplomatic support on the issues with India. So the role of the United States got suspicious in this regard. Many reservations were raised about their role in preservation of Pakistan interests yet both the partners continue to support each other due to certain different reasons. Pakistan maintained an appropriate distance from China as its policies

<sup>55</sup> Ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Zulifqar Ali, Pak US Relations Pre-9/11Era (Lahore: Peace Publications, 2013), 103.

were more align to west block. Though, China didn't openly condemn her alliance with the US because they understand the reason of joining the western block. Pakistan supported the patron state during the cold war and 1954-60 were the heydays of this alliance.

However, in the long run, this alliance proved counter-productive to both Pakistan and the US. Pakistan was given economic and military aid by the US that helped to create balance in the region while India tilted to The Soviet Union to get the military aid and material. To move away India from the Soviet Union, the US gave aid and assistance to India that created distrust and suspicion in the eyes of Pakistan resultantly, Pakistan moved to the China for military support. Due to the indo-Soviet close collaboration, threat perception increased and further worsened the security situation in the region. The relationship that had established between Pakistan and the US after the signing of defense pacts now took a new dimension after the patron's compromise to the client's interests yet client continued to have bilateral ties with the patron.<sup>57</sup>

# Relationship at the Lowest Ebb with the US and Revising the Foreign Policy 1962-71

Pakistan started to review its policy in the decade of 70s. Two developments took place at that time. The Soviet Union threatened to retaliate in the same coin in the aftermath of U-2 crises as it was supposed to be launched from Pakistani base. American administration had developed intercontinental ballistic missile so the significance of the land bases decreased. Moreover, American tilted towards India by weighing it as a counterweight of China. Pakistan was cautious of all these developments and realized the US of being a most trusted ally of all at that time.

However, the US was least interested to Pakistani concerns and continued the policy to strengthen India. The United States and the West provided military equipment to the India in the post Sino-Indian war of 1962.<sup>58</sup> Pakistan was most concerned to this because they were given military support after the joining of western sponsored pacts. Now India was being awarded without any conditionality's and were also given nuclear umbrella against China. After the continuation of policies of the United States, Pakistan began to diversify its relations. So Pakistan made strong bilateral ties with the Soviet Union and China. Soviet Union made an

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup>Ali, Pak US Relations, 103.

<sup>58</sup> Rais Ahmed Khan, ed. Pakistan United States Relations. Islamabad: Pakistan Press, 1983: 84.

agreement for assistance in the oil exploration and in development projects. It was visible in the sense that Soviet Union continued to maintain a neutral posture in Pakistan and Indian disputes including Kashmir.

The Soviet Union maintained their stance of neutrality in the war of run of Kutch and offered mediation in the full-fledged war by hosting the both countries declaring in the shape of Tashkent declaration. Many mutual visits took place in the same decade between Pakistan and the Soviet leaders. Soviets supported in terms of arms, economic and culture realms. The relationship between the two started to renew in till the end of the decade. Furthermore, Pakistan established strong ties with China and many pacts signed to enhance the mutual relations. Pakistan also supported China with their permanent seating in the United Nations. China also supported Pakistan for its independence and territorial integrity. They supported the right of self-determination of the Kashmir's and extended arms support in the two subsequent wars with India. Strong bilateral ties established between China and Pakistan by having multiple mutual exchange of visits at high level. Both the states consulted each other regularly on the issues of bilateral interests.

However, America was unhappy over all this; she never liked Pakistan close ties with the Soviet Union and China. The United States showed its reservations but Pakistan payed a little heed to it. Resultantly, the United States stopped Pakistan economic assistance on the construction of new airport at Dhaka at that tome. Same was the fate of third five year plan 1965-70s. Divergence between the two countries widened when Pakistan was unable to get any arm support from the United States in the 1965 war.<sup>59</sup>

The America imposed arms embargo on south Asia which direly affected Pakistan because its entire defense mechanism was dependent upon the United States. No new arms were provided to any of the country. A small amount of arms was provided exceptional by the Nixon government. However, after the next war of 1971 arms embargo enforced again. However, Pakistan for defense procurement approached access to China, Iran, Turkey and some western countries. So Pakistan started independent and multi-prong policy and assured that its relations with one state would not affect relations with other. After the establishment of close ties with the

<sup>59</sup> ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Farhat Mehmood, A History of US- Pakistan Relations (Islamabad: Vanguard, 1991), 123.

China and the Soviets, Pakistan didn't leave the membership of the western pacts and continued it. For having its defense pacts membership with the west and the US, Pakistan gave a little importance to the Soviets proposal for South Asian collective self-defense. So the Soviets were dishearten on the Pakistan treatment to their collective defense proposal and they were also annoyed on Pakistan role in establishing diplomatic ties between the China and the United States.

During the 1971 war, Soviet Union provided full-fledged support and used veto power three times for India when Pakistan pleaded for ceasefire in the United Nations by giving India enough time to control and break East Pakistan. The United States and the China avoided criticizing Pakistan military move. America talked about the territorial integrity and China provided full-fledged diplomatic support. So it seems clear crystal that Pakistan revised its policies due to the United States disregard of Pakistan's insecurities by developing strong ties with India. Relations between both the states remained uncertain, un-trusted so it could never developed to a strong bilateral alliance between Pakistan and India. It is pretty visible that the relations between Pakistan and the United States saw both convergence and divergence of interests which sometime brought them together and sometime led far away. Soon after its independence the relationship of Client and Patron established between Pakistan and the United States.

Pakistan being weak and new-born state depended heavily on the United States and offered their loyalty by signing the defense pacts of SEATO and SENTO with west in general and America in particular for economic, political and military sponsorship which established a very strong cliental relation. The United States was having an arch rival and competitor in shape of the Soviet Union so wanted to sign more and more pacts by making many states as their client states.

Pakistan kept its loyalty intact till the United States ignored its interests by putting its insecurities in the realm of India at the backburner and tilted much to India. However, Pakistan being a client state never left the membership of these western sponsored defense pacts which were Soviet-centric. But its one effect was that Client state also started searching other Patron in the outer world who could assure their security, provide them arm assistance, and extend economic and diplomatic assistance for viable security and progress of the state. At that time Pakistan was successful in having close bilateral ties with China and succeeded to equalize the equation by getting support of China in her favor vis-à-vis India. However, its continued ties with its old

master could never allow it to develop strong relations with the Soviet and the Client state once again had to face the wrath of the Soviets when the patron was maintaining a neutral stance and denied any defensive support to the client against India. The 70s witnessed significant changes in the major external powers interactions with the region of South Asia.<sup>61</sup>

The US lost her interest in this region because of their attention towards other regions of conflict. The United States accepted the strategic shift in power balance in the region in the post 1971 scenario due to its diverted attention and gave India a leading status in the region by desiring to have bilateral relations on equal footing. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union also became a large supplier of sophisticated arms and weapons to India. The United States retreated in Vietnam and wanted to its allies much burden to defend them from hostile external factors. At that time Pakistan was deprived of Patron except Iran and China but neither of them could be substitute of the US at that time. India was in wonderful situation having friendship with the Soviet Union and built strong ties with the US quietly. Situation was not in favor of Pakistan at that point of time because the US least interest in the region had decreased Pakistan significance and India took advantage of the situation in full length by developing close ties with all the major powers of the world. 62

# Isolation and Establishing Bilateral Ties with Big Powers 1971-80

The independent approach which had started in 60s now took the shape of bilateralism and non-alignment policy during this era of world affairs. Pakistan followed the policy of mutuality of interests at the bilateral level without siding anyone.

It did not compromise its relations with one state for the sake of the other state. During the 70s, American Détente with both the Soviet Union and China and Sino-Soviets decreased the US concerns in this region. After the loss of East Pakistan there was no reason for Pakistan to continue the SEATO. However, CENTO continued more of for turkey and Iran rather than west and the US.<sup>63</sup>

bidid

<sup>62</sup> Musa Khan Jalalzai, The Crises of Pakistan's Foreign Policy (Lahore: Ameer Sameer publisher, 1999), 62.

<sup>63</sup> ibid

The relationship resumed to some extent when the US restored the economic support and lifted the embargo but soon the issue of nuclear weapons destabilized the relationship. Indian nuclear test in 1974 further aggravate the security vulnerability in conventional terms and now Islamabad felt the possible nuclear threat to its very existence from India. So, disillusioned from the America, the Soviet Union and the Chinese, Pakistan followed two-pronged policy. To acquire nuclear weapons and to have close ties with the Muslim world this directly confronted it with the United States. During this phase Islamabad also withdrawn from SEATO and commonwealth. After that it mainly focused on the economic development and political ties with other state while interaction. Pakistan withdrew from SENTO in 1979 as well. It maintained its relations on the basis of mutuality and bilateralism with the big powers in the arena of world politics.<sup>64</sup> In the beginning of this decade Pakistan relations with the United States were very cordial but later on, on the issue of nuclear weapons many differences erupted between the two till the end of the decade.<sup>65</sup>

However, the United States reassure the Pakistan independence and territorial integrity which contributed to normalize the relations. A big difference arose between Pakistan and the United States when Pakistan made a deal with France in 1974 for nuclear reprocessing plant. So America left no stone unturned to stop this nuclear support to Pakistan for nuclear processing. All the military, economic, diplomatic and economic support was stopped by the patron there and then. Ultimately, the US became successful by convincing France to withdraw from the agreement of providing nuclear reprocessing plant to Pakistan.

Despite all of this, when the US came to know that Pakistan was working covertly on the nuclear weapon programme at Kahuta then they suspended all the economic and military aid to Pakistan as well. Burning of the US embassy was also another unpleasant incident that brought the bilateral relations at very limited and lower level in this phase of time.<sup>66</sup>

At the end of the decade an angry mob set the US embassy on fire this made Pakistan pariah state in the eyes of the US. But later on, on the Afghanistan invasion by the Soviet Union, US

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup>Shirin R. Tahir-Kheli, *India*, *Pakistan and the United States: Breaking with the Past* (Lahore: Vanguard Publisher, 1998). 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> David Armstrong, and Joseph Trento, America and the Islamic Bomb (New Hampire: Steer Forth Press, 2007), 40

<sup>66</sup> ibid

revised its policy towards the client state to gain services to discredit the communist influence and forces in the region by devising a plan of action to minimize its position and political status. In the 1980s president carter offered 400m dollar for the economic and military assistance to Pakistan and reinforced the treaty of cooperation but now it was irrelevant after the 1971 after the disintegration of East Pakistan where United States remained aloof. Pakistan categorically rejected this offer. However, a better plan was worked out by the Reagan administration in 1981 for the economic and military assistance for the cooperation of Pakistan against the Soviet invasion on Afghanistan and it became the basis of the 'new relationship.'

The cliental relation between Pakistan and the US was more limited in scope and more formal and inflexible in nature. This flexibility was given by the patron to the Client to get her services in the Afghan episode and threw the communist influence out from the region and global political arena. Close ties with the clients were inevitable because it was almost impossible for the patron state to fight directly because of geo-strategic compulsions. The US never wanted to have direct confrontation with the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and they needed a client state in the region to fight her proxy war in the region. Obviously, Pakistan was the best option despite its all differences and divergences for the short period of time.

The America wanted to have strong bilateral relation with Pakistan for couple of purposes. To use Pakistan in the Afghan war against their rival Soviet Union to discredit the communist influence and throw from Afghanistan out. To, contain the growing nuclear programme of Pakistan and have a check on it.<sup>68</sup> The US should realize her interests and perceptions in the region and could use it in future for the deployment of forces. Economic and military assistance was being provided to Pakistan and the US was not going to have any say in the defense of Pakistan. It was a unique and exclusive kind of relationship that had established between Pakistan and the US as a client and patron that was going to be durable and constant. During cold war Pakistan supported the western ideology after joining capitalist block because Pakistani leaders thought that to join the dominating US would be beneficial for the solution of Kashmir issue, economic progress and defense empowerment. As avoiding the US was negative for it and would have no roots in the masses so on the aid of the US they responded positively. It is quite

68 ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup>Maleeha Loodhi, *The External Dimensions* (Lahore: Jang Publishers, 1994), 35.

crystal clear that all the aid given was misused; if it had been used properly then Pakistan would have been economically stable country.

## Afghanistan Episode and Revival of Relations with US 1980-90

The transformed international environment in the post cold war period calls for Pakistan's foreign and security policy. Pakistan's geo-strategic location is significant for the regional and global powers. Due to the presence of the Soviet Union in this region made Pakistan relevant in the cold war. For the United States Pakistan was significant for the containment of Communism and to make security arrangements to keep check on the Soviet Union.<sup>69</sup> It was only due to their containment policy in which Pakistan was very important due to her strategic location; the US successfully made close ties with Pakistan in the 50s.<sup>70</sup> Although, now there was no cold war and containment policy ended with the emergence of the US as a sole superpower and now policy was engagement and emphasize was to combat the common and global emerging problems. Afghan war brought far reaching geo-political implications for Pakistan.

This military intervention by the major power was perceived as violation of independence and territorial integrity of a Muslim state. Pakistan usually had strain relations with the Soviet Union in the past and now their presence in the neighborhood was taken as a real threat to Pakistan territorial integrity.<sup>71</sup>

Pakistan wanted the Soviet Union troops out of the area so it supported and accommodated the guerilla forces in the area with the aid of America. Afghan war also proved to be a turning point in the bilateral relations of Pakistan and the United States which moved from a lower level coordination to the strong economic, political and military ties in the 1980s.<sup>72</sup> The US provided military and economic assistance to Pakistan against the Soviet Union. Pakistan was provided with multi-billion economic and military assistance packages by the US and relationship developed to very close and cordial with Pakistan by having strong influence and presence in Pakistan.<sup>73</sup> Despite strong cooperation with Islamabad on Afghan war both the states diverge on the issue of Nuclear weapons. However, the United States ignored the issue for the time being to

73 ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup>Hafeez Malik, Soviet - Pakistan Relations and Post Soviet Dynamics (London: Macmillan Publisher, 1994), 253.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Fredric Grare, Pakistan and the Afghan conflict 1979-1985 (UK: Oxford Press, 2003), 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> M. Raziullah Azmi, *Pakistan American Relations* (Karachi: royal book company, 1994), 64.

keep Pakistan on board on Afghan war.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, in the post withdrawal period of the Soviet troops, the US turned its tilt from Afghanistan by leaving it entangled in intra-Afghanistan conflicts and pro-Soviet government in Kabul.

American stopped aiding the Afghan refugees in Pakistan and refused to deny that Pakistan possess nuclear weapon and imposed sanctions under the pressler amendment. With this step all kind of economic assistance and military sales to Pakistan stopped. All the sales programme of weapons and training suddenly disrupted and took a serious turn in the relations of Islamabad and Washington. Pakistan also had to face the post Afghan dilemmas because America left the partner alone which direly affected the economy of Pakistan due to a major influx of Afghan refugees.<sup>75</sup>

It is ironic that Pakistan always suffered due to its strong alliance with the United States which always used it in the need of hour and left alone after the completion of the task. It seems apparently that the United States policy of collective defense was Soviet centric and their major concern was to downgrade the communism and weakened them by all means. The Patron kept engaged Pakistan to prevent it from going to the Soviet Union to discredit the influence of the rival state in the strategic location of the world by having complete control of Pakistan.

America used all means to get the maximum benefit out of the Pakistan by keeping it loyal to them and main services provider for them. In return the United States provided rewards in terms of economic and military support that was temporary and event-oriented. Dual policy of the United State came in front of Pakistan during its conflicts with India but it is unfortunate for the client to remain loyal and get used when needed.

Same was the case during the Afghan war when once again Pakistan used and left alone to face the music of this bilateral alliance with the West. Although, Pakistan revised its foreign policy after the realization of the dual policy of America but they kept their loyalty intact. Relationship between Pakistan and the United States saw many upheavals and some times short term breaks but in the long run their bilateral relations continued and never come to an end. Its true that after the end of Afghan war Pakistan realized that Washington can never be loyal to it at any cost or at

75 ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup>A.Z. Hilali, US-Pakistan Relationship (England: Asghate publisher, 2005), 144.

any point of time so now they seriously started to revise its polices and look towards other big and regional powers in the neighborhood to get out of the clutches of the United States and decrease reliance on it to make its polices more independent and broader in perspectives.<sup>76</sup>

### Post Cold War Dilemma and Nuclear Issue 1991-2000

In the post cold war phase Pakistan geo-strategic importance once again decreased in the eyes of the United States. They payed little attention to the stability and economic development of Pakistan and the world obviously witnessed another turning point in the relationship of Pakistan and the United States. The US became little concerned with this region especially Pakistan after the downfall of the Soviet Union and now had no real interests in Pakistan for its cooperation and bilateral relation so they suspended all the economic and military support to Pakistan.

Moreover, Pakistan continued to develop its nuclear programme in the post cold war era and developed close ties with other big powers of the world like China. In 1998 India conducted nuclear test which destroyed the balance of power phenomenon in the South Asian region. So, Pakistan conducted tit-for-tat tests and directly came under the wrath of the super power. Pakistan suffering increased more when the United States imposed more sanctions on Pakistan after the nuclear tests in 1998.

However, these miseries increased further when military dictator came into power then many sanctions came against Pakistan. There was a major drift in the Pakistan-US relations in post cold war era. Because in the post cold war time the task of the US was to downgrade the influence of the Soviet Union in the region so succeeded in her objective, now the strategic relevance of Pakistan had lost for the United States. It was not willing to take the responsibility of economic development and modernizations of Pakistan military capabilities.

There were multiple factors that decreased the strategic importance of Pakistan like downfall of Soviet Union and end of cold war etc. After the downfall of the Soviet Union there was not a single strong competitor of the Unites States in the world political arena as they emerged as a sole super power and it was the success of the western values as well. Afghanistan was not on the United States priority and they tilted towards the other regions of the world to influence the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup>Maria Madalena, Fischer L. Carvalho, and Matthias Fischer, *Pakistan under Siege: Pakistan after September 11<sup>th</sup>*, 2001(Islamabad: Vanguard Books, 2004), 73.

world at large. Pakistan a client state also lost its significance along with Afghanistan because the Soviet Union broke up and cold war ended. Now the patron had no interests in this client state anymore.<sup>77</sup>

There was a complete shift in the super power policies now they turned to India to reinstate their relations which had to some extent disappeared due to the United States cooperation with Pakistan and polices in Afghanistan previously. Almost four kinds of sanctions were imposed on Pakistan in this phase of bilateral relations in the post Cold war era when engagement was at lowest level. Under the Pressler amendment almost all the economic assistance and sale of arms was suspended to Pakistan by America for the pursuance of its non-proliferations policy. Another round of sanctions of economic assistance was imposed on Pakistan after conduct of its tests of nuclear weapons in 1998.<sup>78</sup>

Another round of sanctions were imposed on Pakistan when army dictator took the charge of state, all the economic assistance stopped under the US law in which economic relations are suspended with the regimes which overthrow the elected governments. So, Musharraf regime also came under these sanctions. There was a final round of sanctions that were applied on Pakistan in 2000-2001 on the pretext that Pakistan might be taking missile technology from the China and Korea. During this phase of bilateralism between two strategic partners, double standards were quite visible in the policies of America to Islamabad.

For the reward of all its services to the patron Pakistan declared as a terrorist state in 1990s by the United States for helping the freedom fighters in Kashmir. Another issue of souring relations between Pakistan and the United States was that of Islamabad help for Taliban regime in Kabul. So Patron decided to calm Pakistan by releasing economic and military armament sale for which Pakistan had paid before the imposition of Pressler amendment and the money for f-16 air crafts was partly paid back and rest was adjusted for the price of aircrafts previously delivered and other for the storage charges of air crafts but never delivered the aircrafts to Pakistan. One of major causes for conducting nuclear weapons tests was that now Pakistan was sure of non-support from the United States in terms of economic development and armament advancement.

A.Z. Hilali, US – Pakistan Relations: Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan (USA: Asghate publishing company, 2005), 188.
 Shirin R. Tahir-Kheli, India, Pakistan and the United States: Breaking with the Past (Lahore: Vanguard Publisher, 1998), 83.

Previously, Pakistan was dependent on the US and west for the surety of their security vis-à-vis India and technological advancement in military field now perceived and understood that conduct of nuclear tests was necessary to establish the balance in the region.<sup>79</sup>

It was also pretty clear the US always pursue the self-centered policies and now the importance of Pakistan's geo-strategic location had decreased after the demise of the Soviet Union. Pakistan realized the double-standard policies of the United States along with this understanding that it would never come to rescue her so nuclear tests were inevitable to avoid the Indian wrath and maintain minimum credible deterrence in the region. Several factors shaped Pakistan's relations with the United States as a client and patron partners. However, all of them were not equally important and their ability to influence the relations varied from time to time. The prerogative of foreign policy making since beginning was with the ruling elite so Pakistan's foreign policy reflected their ideas and perceptions. The ruling elite were western oriented, legacy of the colonial masters and had urge to have friendly relations with western powers. There eco-political interests and opposition for communism made them understand to stay away from the Soviet Union and built strong ties with the west.

Pakistan needed economic and military cooperation aligned with the western block to fulfill her requirements and sought help from western countries in the midst of cold war. However, this decision was not taken with the national consensus because the opposition of the United States military alliances doesn't rely on the US for its security.

Keeping in mind the geographical compulsions, Pakistan also wanted to have close ties with Soviet Union and not to involve in the East-West conflict. It was not agreeing with the opinion that Islam forbid to have friendly relations with neighboring Soviet Union. The left wing school of thought in Pakistan believe that the cost for economic and defense assistance was high in the shape of estranged Soviet Union and economic dependence on the west. Due to the changing environment of 60s and following this policy of multilateralism, Pakistan decided to establish good ties with the neighboring Soviet Union with the visit of Ayub.

It was believed that ideological disparity can be overlooked when there is a question of state survival and stability. Pakistan-Soviet relations came under strains when they perceived acts of

<sup>79</sup> ibid

Pakistan detrimental to their security interests. Pakistan's decision to make alliances with west for support and arranging rapprochement between the China and the US annoyed the Soviet Union because they feel Pakistan more on their side for the geographical proximity. As a result of which Pakistan had to face severe penalties in case of the Kashmir and Durand line issue in which Pakistan strongly opposed by the Soviet Union on the platforms of United Nations. During its two wars with India when the US left Pakistan in helplessness Soviet Union provided arms and ammunition to India in these wars against Pakistan and Pakistan plea to ceasefire in post 1971 war vetoed by Soviet Union that gave enough time to India to break East wing of Pakistan. It is a harsh reality to mention here that though Pakistan had defense alliance with America but they never came to rescue it in the need of the hour. Two full scale conflicts with India opened the eyes of policy makers in Pakistan that the US was never sincere to her then they turned to the other major powers to decrease its complete reliance on the United States slowly.

However, bilateral alliance between Pakistan and the US after the end of the defense pacts describes Pakistan's cliental status in terms of its cooperative relations with the US and complete economic dependence that exists ever since beginning. With the passage of time and changing global political scenario dynamics of this client-patron relations between Pakistan and the US are changing and reaching on a new stage. However, it would be too early to say anything about this relationship because new era is opening new challenges with the change in the global order in the coming years ahead.

It's obvious of the fact that the American interests in Pakistan have been for short term and event oriented. Pakistan has been treated more of strategic ally of the patron rather treated as a nation. The relationship between Pakistan and the US has been fluctuating continuously. Though, the US assured that its interests in Pakistan would not come to an end even if the Afghanistan issue is solved. Pakistan wanted the US to treat it as a nation and their security and economic interests ensured in the longer period of time. It wanted to bring the past harshness in the new warmed relationship for the durability of strategic partnership.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup>Mahboob A. Popatia, Pakistan's Relations with the Soviet Union 1947-79 (Karachi: Pakistan study center, 1988),

<sup>47.</sup> 81 ibid

However, American double standards that vary from case to case may deteriorate the relationship between client and patron. Until and unless, the United States ensure the security and economic development of Islamabad for a longer period of time it seems impossible for it to have full-fledged services, full compliance and loyalty of the client on every critical issue. It would only create distrust and suspicion in the circles of the client state that can be hazardous for the durability and bilateral ties between client and patron in future times.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</sup>A. Z. Hilali, US – Pakistan Relations: Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan (USA: Asghate Publishing Company, 2005), 234.

### CHAPTER THREE

This chapter mainly focuses on the ideological dimension of the cliental relations between Pakistan and the United States. It has further elaborated that how ideological aspect plays its role in the cliental political relations. How ideological perspectives work out particularly, when there is a divergence of ideologies or clash of ideologies. In this context this relationship has beautifully analyzed the geo-strategic and politico-security compulsions that compel the client states to cooperate with the patron states despite ideological disparity. It also argues the American tradition of interlinking ideology with its foreign policy and how it justifies it vis-à-vis rest of the world and particularly Pakistan. The role of ideology in cliental politics explains the how ideology becomes functional in the pursuit of desired goals of the states in the start of the chapter.

# Ideological Convergence/Divergence and Cliental Politics

Sixth Section elaborated the global ideological goals of the Imperial America in the world in general and Asia in particular. It explains how the United States wanted to maintain its hegemony by controlling the world political dynamic under the pretext of ideological consolidation.

Moreover, chapter explains the United States imperialistic designs for which it is intervening in the other states affairs under the pretext of peace and stability. It further argues that there exists a disparity between Islamabad and Washington in terms of economy and military capabilities however, despite ideological diversity Pakistan has joined capitalist block for the consolidation of capitalist ideology because of certain strategic, political and economic compulsions. The United States for the completion of its ideological imperialistic designs, pursuing policy of bilateral strategic partnership with Pakistan because of geo-strategic significance of Pakistan in the regional and global context and above all in the war on terror and Afghanistan crises subsequently where Islamabad can play a decisive role without any doubt.

### Role of Ideology in the Cliental Relationship

Ideology plays a key role in the formulation of foreign policy and states mutual interactions. Ideology is one of the key determinants that are kept under considerations during states

interaction at bilateral, multilateral and global because states seldom ignore their ideological preferences except security and survival is at stake. Foreign policy of a state is reflected by their ideology affiliations because states seldom go against their ideologies. Ideology being a key determinant of the foreign policy defines the policy priorities of any country in international political arena. It has been usually seen in the interstate relations that alliances are made and high level cooperation is observed amongst the states where there is an ideological convergence. Even if there is ideological disparity states may cooperate by keeping in view their survival and security. However, sometimes, it is observed if the states have affinity of interests then they collaborate with each other in the pursuance of their mutual interests with mutual effective cooperation keeping the ideological preferences on the backburner. 83 Just like smaller or weak state coordinates with the stronger states for the fulfillment of their interests while the stronger use the weaker for her its interests and needs when needed. As it is in the case of South Kor where there is strong cliental relation between both the strategic partners So, patron state is helped by the client state to strengthen its ideology and political interests in anarchical world most significantly, where there is a competitive environment and it also helps patron in the completion of its strategic goals in the world political system vis-a-vis big powers while client state is rewarded and extended help for the insurance of its security.<sup>84</sup>

Sometimes, client state becomes reluctant to cooperate or follow the policy of non-compliance having certain reservations; in that case it is punished with prohibition of any kind of support if on serious issue, but compromised if that is on less severe issue. One of the major dynamics of the cliental relations is Ideological affinity. It can be taken in this relationship as that if there is an ideological affinity between client and patron that would be most stronger and long term relation as compare to where both the strategic partner have different ideological priorities. Ideological convergence may lead to the strong and stable cliental relationship while divergence of ideology on the part of both the states can make the relation de-stable, short term and full of upheavals and uncertainty. As it evident from the fact of Capitalistic ideology where the United States have strong relation with many countries of the world.

<sup>84</sup> Shahid M. Amin, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy* (UK: Oxford University Publisher, 2010), 297.

<sup>83</sup> Dan Barak, "US-Pakistan Relations." Military and Strategic Affairs Vol. 3, No. 2, November (2011): 40.

In case of ideological divergence a relationship of trust never established so it results into the weak cooperation and weak cliency. Mutual bilateral long term ties seldom established between the two. Keeping this ideological perspective in view apparently both patron and client assure their cooperation but actually they don't. It is like that a patron would assure the security of the client, extend help for the sophistication of military capabilities to neutralize the threats and economic assistance for the stability of the client state and political support on all the levels. But because of distrust and lack of sincerity don't assist the small partners in any realm when its task accomplished and client is of no use anymore. When patron state leaves the client and suspends all kind of assistance then client states also move away with, to search another master to fulfill its needs, requirements and umbrella her security concerns but are used by the patron when needed with the offers of larger benefits and rewards. However, in all that case bilateral ties in the shape of cliental relationship remains constant. <sup>85</sup>

### Pakistan-US Relations in the Wake of Communism

After the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war Britain was unable to continue her role as a big power and the United States had two options at that moment either allow Soviet Union to fill the gap or abandon its isolation and passive policy and start a policy to counter Russia. By adopting the later course of action, the US became the leader of the world cause. The South Asian region after the partition saw another divide in the foreign policy orientation according to their ideological affiliation the two new born countries Pakistan and India. The socialist learning of the India tilted it to the communist block while the anti-communist sentiments coupled with the security needs led Pakistan to make strong alliance with the United States.

For all of American commitments to promote democracy its first commitment was anti-communism. Therefore, Pakistan and the US became strong anti-Communist allies during the cold war era. In the post-colonial period many countries in the Third world emerged with their sponsors. Pakistan military had more strong influence due to incompetence of politicians so they became deserving party of the US funds. Kashmir issue was also another factor which kept the significance of the military more effective. The America awarded funds to the anti-communist religious parties to get support and to keep them alive at that point of time. <sup>86</sup> The patron concerns

86 Hassan Abbas, Pakistan's Drift into Extremism (New Delhi: Pentagon press, 2005), 9.

<sup>85</sup> Irfan Hussain, Fatal Fault lines, Pakistan, Islam and the West (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2012), 142.

about Pakistan in 70s about nuclear programme, military rule and propagation of Islam in the Pakistani politics (Zia's version of Islam) vanished when the Soviet Union attacked on Afghanistan. All the aids and assistance that was suspended immediately reversed and started supporting Pakistan in terms of military, economic, material and morale. Pakistan had signed mutual defense pact with the US to oppose the expanding communism under the assurance of territorial integrity of Pakistan.<sup>87</sup>

According to the common Americans, the United States should be admired nation in the eyes of the Muslim world. After all, it wanted to bring the Wilsonian Liberalism to the Muslim World: peace, democracy and free market.

While the United States strategy towards Muslim world is based on those factors which are caused of rampant anti-Americanism by the Muslims. An ideological clash erupted between the Muslims and the United States when double standard policies formulated based on national interests by America. At present, America is pursuing many double standard policies towards the Muslim world in general and Pakistan in particular. There is a double standard of removing the weapons of mass destruction, the US has never raised the question on Israel on its right to have weapons of mass destruction as in their opinion Israel would use them in justifiable means. There are also double standards on the implementation of the United Nations Security Council resolutions in Palestine and Kashmir. Another significant dimension in this regard is double standard by the US on the promotion of democracy. Whenever, there is a matter of strategic interests the United States ignores the fact whether that is democratic government or dictatorial. In case of Pakistan, the United States collaborated with the dictator Parvez Musharraf by legalizing its regime for its own interests, through this way; it has itself violated her ideological norms and democratic ethics of its foreign policy, which it is beguiling throughout the world. It clearly depicts the double standards of the patron, different for different states based on her own interests. There is double standard of minimizing the civilian causalities during the war times. Causalities are only considered by the United States when there is a high death toll rate. High technology is often used to target the terrorists but these are not precise always, when civilian

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup>Musa khan jalalzai, Pakistan, Islam, Diplomacy and Foreign Policy (Lahore: Career Book Publisher, 2006), 145-51.

causalities occur, Washington blame the leadership responsible for all this for providing them civilian shield.<sup>88</sup>

During the cold war period the US establishment belief was that left wing groups in Pakistan may protect communism politically and ideologically in future despite the government anti-communist posture and alliance with the capitalist block. Cold war scenarios were playing extensively in the world over and condition in Pakistan was not quite unique. What really changed the Pakistan and whole game was the US proxy war in Afghanistan. It was due to this war that violence in the name of the Islam was legitimized. All the networks were established to discredit the Soviet Union.<sup>89</sup>

During the first three decades of independence western ruled over Pakistan while entering US led defense pacts. <sup>90</sup> These pacts were made to counter the communism and Pakistani leader collected number of arsenals out of their alliance with the west. From very beginning Pakistan perceived threat from India and most of its policies based upon this. <sup>91</sup> Ideological affinity is a key determinant of client-patron relationship. Patron states always protect those client states which support their ideology to promote their political and ideological agendas in the world over or promote the Patron interests while comparing with other ideologies. World has witnessed two competing ideologies during the cold war period communism and capitalism.

Two big bosses of the world the Soviet Union and the United States were leading these competing ideologies. So it was quite a natural outcome of these superpowers tussle that world divided into two big blocks the capitalist block and communist block. Both the competitor powers started to make alliances with the small countries to gain political and geo-strategic superiority over each other. So for this purpose all the newly emerged states made their alliances with these big powers according to their needs and ideological affiliations. In the post World War 2 this phenomenon of client and patron emerged dominantly because of these two super powers hostility. Pakistan was newly born and weak country in the decade of 50s having many challenges to its security and economy was in search of protector state. The United State

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup>Ahmed Faruqui, Musharraf's Pakistan, Bush's America & the Middle East (Lahore: Vanguard Publisher, 2008), 123.

<sup>123.

89</sup> Saadia Toor, *The State of Islam, Culture and Cold War Politics in Pakistan* (London: Pluto Press, 2011), 99-104.

<sup>91</sup> Irfan Hussain, Fatal Fault lines: Pakistan, Islam and the West (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2012), 87.

<sup>92</sup> Beson Malik, ed. Issues in 21st Century World Politics. England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010: 62.

was a most viable state in this regard and drew the attention of Pakistan leaders most due to the western orientation. Although, there were many left wing groups active in the Pakistan who were more close to socialism and Islam as a religion was also somewhat near to socialism as compare to the capitalism. Pakistan always offered sincere efforts to prove their loyalty but could never get sincere reward from patron. Despite full ideological and political support to their ideology by Pakistan they always used the client state and after using it threw it in the dustbin.

Whenever, they needed they came closer to Pakistan and got full scale services by offering a little token of money and arms assistance to achieve the desired goals and later on, when the task completed they left helpless client in the doldrums and tilted to the most desired ally India.

#### Pakistan and US Ideological Perspective

Cliental relations between Pakistan and the United States were established a long time ago almost from the inception of Pakistan. Though both the partner states have their distinct and unique ideological posture but every one knows that the Unite<sup>93</sup>d States link its ideology with the foreign policy. Having said this, Pakistan have different posture and outlook of its ideology but because of being key strategic ally of the US in their policy to combat terrorism, and established liberal democracy by throwing out the dictatorial regimes it made its policy outlook inline with western block and the US. World has witnessed continuous ups and down throughout the course of actions with each other in the alliance of two strategic partners. Another very important aspect in this regard is that dependent and weak states are compelled to follow the policies of the superpowers for their security, stability and survival irrespective of their ideology however, this is also a reality if ideological affinity exists that relationship can be more stronger and durable. Dependent state like Pakistan can never go for an independent foreign policy because economic dependence makes the states slave of the patron. Only independent states can challenge the tradition of injustice and forceful means.<sup>94</sup>

Ideology is key determinant in the foreign policy making and its parity between two states is significant for the effective cliental relations. Client-patron relation is uniquely analyzed when it is kept on the ideological measures to quantify the strength and durability of the relation. Having,

94 Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Irfan Hussain, Fatal Fault lines: Pakistan, Islam and the West (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2012), 89.

a larger disparity in ideologies, the US seeks the collaboration of Islamabad for the enlargement and strengthening of its ideology by countering the Soviet Union with the large scale help of the client. Moreover, though, both the states having distinct ideological system yet the patron succeeded to get the services by following its traditional policy of mixing the ideology with the foreign policy by giving certain traits of this ideological policy like liberal democracy, peace and free market. Many scholars believe that the imperial wanted to dominate its ideology vis-à-vis any other competitor and globalize it to maintain its monopoly as a sole superpower status. It wanted to meet its global strategic designs in terms of economic development by having access to resourceful countries and keep a check on the emerging opposing ideologies by staying in the region under the guise of war on terror and for what purposes, Islamabad is very crucial to have strategic alliance. It is pertinent to mention here that like cold war period America wanted to use Pakistan for the success of its ideology in the 21<sup>st</sup> century by countering potential emerging powers.

However, sometimes client states like Pakistan become non-compliant to their patron when they suffer unbearable loss or tangible threat to their sovereignty as in the case of continuous drone attacks and Salala check post when Pakistan stopped the NATO supplies. Establishment in Pakistan showed reluctance and stiffness on many occasion by showing non-compliance behavior because of continuous violation of sovereignty and compelled the United States where Washington left with no option but to accept their demands. Over-reliance always forces the client states to comply with the ideological and political policies of the patron and go on with this. Now the dynamics of the world politics has been changing with the passage of time and Pakistan being situated at important geo-strategic location plays a key role as an actor in the US war on terror and other policy matters in this part of the world. Previously, Pakistan continued its allegiance to western ideological block till the end of cold war but it also made strong ties with socialist China and pursued the policy of bilateral relations. Pakistan didn't break its alliance with its old patron but categorically defined that its relations with one state would not affect the relations with other state which sometimes, annoyed the patron yet up till today both the client and patron cooperate with each other and bilateral ties are still going between the two.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>95</sup>M.A. Muqtedar Khan, "Nice But Tough: A Framework of US Foreign Policy in the Muslim World." Brown Journal of World Affairs, Issue 1, Vol. 11 (2002): 356.

Relations between Pakistan and the United States are no different from this scenario. Both the states having the status of client and patron enjoy the longstanding cooperation and alliance.

Pakistan soon after its inception decided to join the capitalist block and kept the communism on back burner because leadership was west oriented. As the client states are used by the patron state for the completion of their objectives so Islamabad also used by its patron occasionally when needed for the extension of their political and ideological designs. Moreover, Pakistan being an Islamic state was closer to the socialist block but joined capitalist block for their underlying interests attached to the USA and tilted to their side by joining hands with them.

The United States being an arch bearer of capitalist block used all the client states for their political agenda and success of capitalism over communism. It is true that the US was more close to India with regards to their ideology as compare to Islamabad but they chose Pakistan as a frontline ally because of geo-strategic location of it in the region that was most concerned region for the west and the US.

It is very obvious from the fact that Pakistan gained a little as compare to loss. Pakistan gained nothing but an opportunistic and non-trusted ally in shape of the United States despite ignoring its ideology for the partner. Due to its opposition to the Soviets Union Pakistan lost the Kashmir issue solution because of having constant opposition by the Soviet Union. India a staunch enemy took benefit from the communist block up till now against Pakistan. Now they have also gained the support of the US by having a civil nuclear deal that would enhance their strength manifold vis-à-vis Pakistan. Pakistan faced desperation despite being a close ally of the US ever since its beginning and could not get such kind of deal from its master. India is taking benefit on two counts, one by having support from the Soviet Union and the other by having support from the US. Now there is a dire need to review its policies in terms of ideology and policy. Pakistan could gain nothing from their ideological proximity with their capitalistic affiliations but used always for their ideological goals as previously against the Soviet Union war in Afghanistan and now in the war on terror in Afghanistan in the post 9/11.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

## An Ideological Alliance to Strategic Partnership

Ideology is a key determinant in foreign policy formulation process in the world politics. The role of ideology has been greater in world politics during the cold war where there was bipolar system. There world has witnessed the division into two blocks communism and capitalism according to their respective interests and parities. In the post colonial period when new states borne on the map of the world, were in need of economic and military support for their existence, survival and stability. On the Other hand, two super powers started the process to make these newly independent states as client states to consolidate their respective strength and minimize the adversary influence by giving the distinct political systems and ideologies.

Every new borne state joined either of the block according to its proximities and for the assurance of its security; survival, economic well being and sophistication in military capabilities to neutralize the threats to their very existence at the initial stage. Pakistan got separated from India and came under the umbrella of western ideology due to her leader's western orientations and for the fulfillment of its economic and security needs from the strong strategic partner.

Another important factor was the compatibility of the western resource rich powers that could surely help Pakistan's economic stability and development of military capability. There were two ideologies on the peak at the time of cold war era. Capitalism and communism having inherent divergences wanted superiority over one another in the world political arena. Both the superpowers were in search of client states in different regions of the world more significantly in Asia where newly borne states needed masters to fulfill their needs. Apparently, Pakistan had no ideological affinity with any of the superpower ideology neither communism nor capitalism but a different outlook of Islamic ideology that is near to socialistic ideology. Pakistan was economically and militarily weak state at the time of emergence and it was looking for a strong country that could help it in economic realm and enlarge the defense capabilities. The end of the dominance of the ideologies has given to the rise of sub-nationalism based on already existing loyalties like ethnicity, religion, race and language by making the world much less safe as compared to the past and posed new threats to the international political system.

Pakistan as an Islamic state was closer to the socialism which emphasize on the social welfare of the people and their basic rights. But it had no resemblance with the capitalist ideological block that had its own distinct out look and priorities. The United States is a torch-bearer of capitalist block wanted to have viable client in the region to strengthen its global designs and to keep check on the emerging communist powers Russia and the China. In the start the US had no interest in Pakistan but they wanted to establish close ties with India as they see it more important and counterproductive for emerging china. During cold war period ideology had been a distinct feature in the foreign policy making and states interactions in political and diplomatic arena. The United States kept on following the policy of making new clients that were willing themselves or compelled to join the capitalist block due to certain geo-strategic, economic and political compulsions. However, weaker and underdeveloped states joined the capitalist block not for their ideological proximities but for their economic, political and military needs and dependence on superpowers.

Pakistan joined the capitalist block because of having western orientation of its leaders and underlying security and political needs due to Indian factor to neutralize the threat perception by getting support of the patron. The relationship of client and patron established between Pakistan and the US since very beginning. For the United States it was an ideological alliance because they wanted to contain the communism with the help of Islamabad. But for Pakistan it was a security alliance because it had no ideological affinity with the American designs but joined it for economic development, political support on Kashmir dispute and assurance of its security from hostile factors. It is quite clear from the fact that this interdependence relationship turned to strategic partnership in the post 9/11 phase. The cliental relationship is just the relationship of dependence where one state depends on the other state for its needs and interests and vice versa. However, in the post 9/11 scenario it is very difficult to assume that there exists any ideological parity between Pakistan and the US. However, Political dynamics of global world almost changed in the post terrorist attacks scenario. The US institutional claim of being international is increasingly becoming irrelevant because west is losing the credibility and attraction to win the hearts and minds of the people. Previously, this block reached to the heights of glory because they gave equal opportunity to all but now the monopoly and accumulation of wealth in few hands is destroying the social values and ideological strength of the west and the US.98

Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup>S.A.M. Pasha, *Islam in Pakistan's Foreign policy* (New Delhi: Global media Publications, 2005), 229-33.

This seems the only reason why the world is becoming increasingly Islamized and Islamic ideology is getting strength gradually. This inequality and sense of superiority on the name of exceptionalism is increasing the gap between west and East. These forceful and extreme actions are taking the Muslim ideology towards the clash with others. However, despite all of these realities, Pakistan is supporting the war on terror with full-fledged scale of cooperation for its own reasons like security and survival.

Moreover, with every next decade the ideological values of the US keep on changing with the changed policy priorities to maintain the hegemony in the world and control the states affairs with the full scale help of the client states. Because the US always demonstrates her ideology through foreign policy and use to correlates ideology with the foreign policy. <sup>99</sup> Pakistan has been the torch-bearer of Muslim ideology and in the pre-9/11 phase it was having pro-Taliban policy. However, after the occurrence of this incident the US threatened it to get ready for punishment in case of non-compliance. So Pakistan took a u-turn in its policy and became a front line ally in the war on terror for the purpose of its peaceful survival and economic stability.

War on terror shows that once again, Pakistan has joined the western block for the survival, security and economic development. Ideology has very little role in the post 9/11 phase since Pakistan has inherently an Islamic ideology that is contrary to the capitalist ideology. Post terrorist attacks alliance seems to be a strategic alliance between Pakistan and the US for the short period of time approximately till the end of the war on terror. However, despite this cooperation in war on terror and interdependence both the states as a client and patron could never establish a long term strategic alliance but for short term and event oriented. Moreover, the United States has a long tradition to link their ideology to their foreign policy. Whether, it is during the cold war when the US started search for the client states in the post colonial period to consolidate their capitalist ideology or in the contemporary times to promote liberal democracy in the world. America always gave the message of peace and democracy as a 1<sup>st</sup> priority in their ideological foreign policy however, their grand strategic designs remained intact under the guise of this ideological policies. There is no denying the fact that cold war diplomacy was channelized to promote the capitalist ideology. There were very few examples where cordial

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup>Abdul Latif Tunio, "Pakistan and the changing scenario: Regional and Global." Islamabad Policy Research Institute, Islamabad (2008): 156.

relations were developed by the US with the states that were anti-capitalist block. There was a race between the two superpowers to align themselves with the new emerging states for the reasons of superiority. While analyzing the cold war period whole of the foreign policy of the United States revolved around this ideological factor to strengthen the capitalist ideology. So it is not wrong to say that the US policies are based on their ideological beliefs and understandings.

In this way, it can be taken as that interdependence is creating strategic cooperation between two partners despite the ideological divergence in the case study of Pakistan-US strategic alliance. Though, an ideological affinity is a dimension of client-patron relation which requires the client to support the patron's ideology to promote its strength and competition in anarchical world. Islamabad has supported the capitalist ideology during cold war and is supporting it during the war on terror as well. Although, such an ideological affinity is non-existent in this case study of Pakistan-US relations but still two strategic partners are on the cooperation level that brings their polices on converging level that may be analyzed in terms of strategic partnership and policy convergence on the critical issues like war on terror.<sup>101</sup>

World politics has transformed into a new era of relationships among the states that is shaping the new political dynamics overall. Pakistan took a u-turn from its pro-Taliban policy and became a front line ally of war on terror. Previously, its policy was pro-Taliban and had political and ideological affinities with them. In the post 9/11 scenario Pakistan and the United States established a strong strategic alliance to combat the terrorism. This strategic alliance contrary to its previous track record has proved long term cooperation till now and likely to continue till the end of the war on terrorism or probably after then this. But this does meant that the client state complied with all the policies of its imperial strategic partner US.

Islamabad showed non-compliance behavior on many occasion like attacks on Salala check posts for which Pakistan made the United States responsible and demonstrated anger and non-compliant behavior by blocking the NATO supplies. However, this was a temporary thaw which erupted as a reaction to the US troops attacks on Pakistani check posts on boarder areas. It is the beauty of the cliental relationship that patron ignore the non-compliant behavior of the client on

<sup>100</sup> lbid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</sup>Mutahir Ahmed, "The Prospects of Islamic Fundamentalism in the Post Cold War Era." *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 48, no. 2 (1995): 53. http://www.istor.org/stable/41393516 accessed on: 20/05/2013.

less critical issues however, if non-compliance continues then it can break this relationship. This strategic alliance saw many fluctuations in the relationship during this period as a convergence and divergence of interests, cooperation remained workable and alliance remained intact. There is no denying the fact that amongst many dimensions of strategic partnership, one element is ideological affinity that can make the relationship stronger and durable.

However, the case study of Pakistan and the United States as client and patron is quite unique in nature and has proved that even if there is divergence of ideological outlook, alliances and interstate relations can still survive. Moreover, this strategic partnership of Pakistan and the US in post 9/11 has proved workable still if there is an ideological divergence and different policy priorities. Both the partners have different ideology over the different world issues and countries. But still there is a strong relationship of dependence between the two that is the beauty of the client and patron relationship. For instance there is divergence of ideology or policy between both the states on the Palestine issue but still are strategic partners in the war on terror. There are plenty of policy divergences on the war on terror and sometime leads to non-compliance behavior of the client whereas sometimes, patron threatens for not playing real role but still compromise while on the other hand, client tolerate so relationship sustain even if at lowest level of cooperation.

Post 9/11 phase saw policy affinity when Pakistan joined the war on terrorism led by the US by showing the compliant behavior and decided to combat the menace of terrorism till the end. 102 However, many times many clashes and disagreements emerged on many policy moves like Raymond Davis case, Salala air attacks and continuous drone attacks resulted in suspended cooperation with the non-compliant behavior of Islamabad but quite soon resumed either by the threat to suspend economic and military aid or compelled to resume their ties with the Washington to avoid further aggravating the situation. So due to geo-strategic and political compulsions it compelled to revise the ties and reinforce the strategic ties with the strategic partner for the future course of actions. Having said this, America always pressurized Islamabad economically, politically and diplomatically if it showed non-compliant attitude towards the policies of Pentagon at the regional level even if they were against the client's interests. It is law

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>102</sup>Ishtiaq Ahmed, "the Spectre of Islamic Fundamentalism over Pakistan (1947-2007)," in *Pakistan Regional and Global Politics*, ed. Rajshree Jetly (New Delhi: Routledge Publisher, 2009), 175-76.

of nature that weaker has to suffer due to over-dependence and reliance on the stronger partner. However, interdependence may lead this relationship to somewhat to some distance as strong partner wants support of the weaker ally in its promotion in the world global system as a reward of which dependent partner ask for economic and military support for economic stability and prestigious status and survival in global political arena for having affinities with the lone superpower that can enhance its respect and say in the world affairs. <sup>103</sup>

## Militancy and America

There is a difference between political Islam and militant Islam. During the cold war right wing ideological groups strengthened and emerged as powerful faction with the sponsorship of Pakistan to eliminate the Soviet forces from the region. Later on, after the disintegration of the Soviet, these small groups had become powerful forces, although, Islamabad has tried to wipe out these militant factions but they scattered in different areas after the operations in Swat and South Waziristan. These militant started attacking the security personals and other places for mainly two reasons: Pakistan military operations on these militant groups and Washington support in the hot pursuit of these groups. Moreover, continuous drone attacks on these areas of Pakistan as a result of which causalities are taking place indefinitely. The United States is not only pursuing double standards in political and military terms but also on ideological realms as well.

During cold war when Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington legalized not only the actions of these forces by supporting them in political sphere to justify its anti-imperialistic ideology. Ironically, now they declared them terrorists and Islamic militants when they show anti-hegemonic posture to the United States designs in the world in general and Muslim world in particular. This militancy can be viewed as a result of collaborations and resistance instead of taking it in the sense of anti-imperialistic forces. Though, they have shown anti-imperialistic tendencies but it is the result of confrontation and collaboration with their master. The Huntington thesis has further aggrandized the situation when he proposed the clash of

<sup>103</sup> Ihid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>104</sup> Tariq Amin Khan, Genealogy of Post-Colonial State in India and Pakistan (Islamabad: Vanguard Publisher, 2012), 193.

civilization hypothesis. However, militant Islamists groups which once given legal status against Soviet Union by the United States now declared as terrorist groups and anti-American forces. <sup>105</sup>

The rise of militancy in Pakistan against the United States has very costly consequences for the country and its people. Over the last decade, thousands of civilian and military personal have been victim of this extremist violence. The economic condition in the country has become extremely vulnerable in the last one decade, even the basic needs are not available to the common people. Pakistan almost became pliant state by providing all the facilities to the US arm forces by providing them bases and arresting the people involved in planning the 9/11 attacks. After the threats from Pentagon almost changed all the policy priorities based on the Islamic ideology and shaped these polices based on security, survival and economic national interests. Undoubtedly, Pakistan political and military elite have mortgaged the country sovereignty to the Washington, but always pretend to be helpless when anger of the public increase especially against the aerial drone attacks. To meet the United States demands and address the people anger against the US intervention, the manipulative conduct of Pakistan's ruling elite and their divided loyalties resulted in half-hearted attempt by the military to confront the Taliban. <sup>106</sup>

This is a reality that military has been actively targeting the Taliban, but they can attack at will and more secure sites, it highlights severe problem related to how Pakistani state has been restructured to fight the war on terror. Many efforts have been made to make Pakistan a secure state but this concept of securitization is futile unless main issues are addressed. Almost all the law enforcement forces are fighting against terrorism but these efforts will remain futile until main issues of great concern are resolved. These policies to secure the state based on western security state concept has not resulted in the idea of the protection of the state but strengthened the militancy in the region. The war on terror has multiple dimensions: firstly Washington has named this war as a long war and next purpose is to obtain its economic and geo-political and strategic interests in the shape of great game. Many westerns have framed their visions on this war on terror, which has the goal of confronting those who oppose their interests and ideology of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>105</sup>Ziad Haider, "Ideological Adrift," In *Pakistan Beyond Crises State*, ed. Maleeha Loodhi (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 127.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>106</sup> Abdul Sattar, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy* (UK: Oxford University Publisher, 2007), 257.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup> Zahid Hussain, "Battling Militancy," In *Pakistan Beyond Crises State*, ed. Maleeha Loodhi (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 138.

western civilizations dominance and those who oppose the United States hegemony. Islamic militants have been opposing ideology behind and against to civilizations narration so, are direct target of the US militarism because their ideology is against the imperial vested interests at present time.

These ideologically motivated foes are militarily mismatched, the Pakistani state cannot side with either party but it also cannot remain neutral because once they were involved in nurturing these militant during the Afghan war. It is vital if Islamabad confronts with these elements, but this has to be internal decision of the state with the support of the people of the country. <sup>108</sup> By the same token, Pakistani rulers must muster the courage to resist the United States pressure and start putting an end to its interference in the country, while taking the difficult steps to become less dependent on the US. None on this will be so easy and one cannot ignore the wrath unleashed by the angry imperialist hegemon, but its quite necessary if the client wants to be free from its imperialist patron. It is quite obvious that Pakistan survival as a cohesive and viable state depends on whether it can resist the US and take steps to become more autonomous. <sup>109</sup>

## Confrontation between Imperial United States and Militancy Post 9/11

The confrontational level is high between the two foes and obviously the cold war strategy is quite irrelevant against such a force which has equally strong ideology to enforce their own version of ideology and political system, no matter how much US demoralize these Islamic forces in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan and used force against it. After the fight in the war on terror in Ten years the conclusion has been derived that these forces cannot defeated militarily because they are faceless, stateless, geographically scattered and ideologically strong forces. These militant Islamist can not be defeated because they are ideologically motivated forces and having affinities in other Muslim states with their strong ideological roots. The idea of perpetual war will only drain the resources of the imperial and would keep the western states in a state of anxiety and fear.

The Pakistan political leadership is also need to recognize the futility of being a US client for almost 60 years, but this realization would only come to the ruling elite when people and

<sup>108</sup> ibid

circumstances force the later to act accordingly then it would be in sight. To prepare for this, the leadership needs to consider how it will confront the militants as their ideology is shaking the vary foundation of the state. There is a need of strong counter ideology to defeat the extremist ideology on the state level. This could be possible by closing down madrassas and putting their students in the mainstream educational system as estimated, there are 40,000 madrassas operative in Pakistan. To bridge the gap and counter their ideology, state needs to open institutions to directly confront the narrow ideological and sectarian perspective of militants, while offering an alternative vision that promotes and realizes shared democratic citizenship. A shared strategy is need of the hour to counter these extremist ideologies within the state. However, this is only possible when original bone of contention is erased between the foes and all imperialistic intervention is stopped by the state to avoid the domestic instability.

It is pertinent to mention here that the United States wanted the domination of Christian civilization in military, political, social, cultural or economic realm. Super power wanted to keep strict control on the world patterns by holding its hegemony in place. There is no doubt about it that they wanted to maintain their hegemony and control on almost all the dynamics of the world. But one bitter reality in this regard is that Americans having the largest population of Christians are very hardliner in religious terms.<sup>111</sup>

It is very clear in front of all the people of the world that Washington manipulate its ideology to proceeds its ideological goals by mixing it with the foreign policy to achieve the greater designs. The main point of importance is that it wanted to promote the Christian civilization and wanted to see it on the peak in the world. However, clash crupts between them and Muslim rightist wings who also wanted to regain the glory of Islam back to the zenith. This is much visible in the post 9/11 attacks when the United States mentioned these attacks on all the Christians and referred it to the clash of civilization rather than an attack by the certain terrorist factions. <sup>112</sup> This certainly explains that these attacks provided them an opportunity to promote their

<sup>110</sup> wikipedia.org/wiki/Madrassas\_in\_Pakistan

Owen Bennet Jonnes, *Pakistan Eye of the Storm* (London: Yale University Press, 2002), 277. Owen Bennet Jonnes, *Pakistan Eye of the Storm* (London: Yale University Press, 2002), 282.

ideological goals to rule the world at large by decreasing the influence of Islam by defaming it and correlating the terrorism and religion of Force. 113

# Pakistan-US Ideological Divergence in Cliental Relations Dynamics in the Post 9/11Phase

A strong cliental relationship exists between Pakistan and the United States since the very beginning. However, the events of 9/11 terrorist attacks totally changed the dynamics of the world politics. These attacks on the US were given more weightage than just terrorist act. Soon after the occurrence of these attacks the US made Muslim responsible for these attacks. Many conspiracy theories were given in this regard like by the Huntington, 'clash of civilizations' in which he accused Muslims of attacking the Christianity. A campaign started in the world that all the western countries should get together to counter the Muslim terrorist as this is an attack on whole of the Christian civilization. Once again Pakistan came under the direct wrath of the United States due to its geo-strategic location in the region in the neighborhood of Afghanistan where according to the US the culprits of the terrorist attacks were hiding and had safe heavens. 114

There are many ideological assumptions regarding cliental politics, some believe that Islam is not a religion of peace and spread with the sword, what makes their belief concrete is that terrorist attacks on the pentagon are the continuation of this forceful ideology of the Muslim world, and Pakistan being a Muslim state is promoting such aggressive and extremist activities of the terrorism. Other believes that 9/11 was an attack on the Christians so it is the same idea of clash of civilization proposed by the Samuel p. Huntington. They altogether ignored the fact of Crusade actions and the reality that a terrorist has no religion. Islam did not spread by the forceful means but instead with peaceful means. The pace of Conversion from other religions to Islam in the greater speed clearly depicts the purity and reality of it. Though, ideological clashes are there but this is a ground reality that Islamabad is supporting American's ideology of liberal democracy and combat against the terrorism, this is the uniqueness of cliental politics. Pakistan had strong ties with Afghanistan especially the Taliban regime before the 9/11 events, the United

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>113</sup>Bruce Riedel, *Deadly Embrace-Pakistan*, *America and Future of Global Jihad*, (Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, 2001), 114.

Rais A. Khan, "Pakistan\_ United States Relations: An Appraisal." American Studies International, Vol. 23, No. 1, April (2005): 93.

States repeatedly threatened and warned of dire consequences if Pakistan would not provide full cooperation in the combat of terrorism. So in the broader interests of Pakistan survival and security it took u-turn in her policy and joined war on terror as frontline ally of the United States. Islamabad once again threatened of dire consequences by the patron if would not comply with. 115

Pakistan being a client state supported the US in their ideological war against communism by all means during cold war, once again decided to follow their ideology to bring peace and security in the world over by fighting against the terrorists in the US sponsored war on terror. 116

Decision to cooperate with the United States in the war on terror by the government of Pakistan faced a strong opposition within the country. All the left wing parties like Jamat-e-Islami and many other religious parties opposed this decision to support the United Stats in their attack on Iraq and Afghanistan and a condition on instability and civil war like situation spread across the country however; Pakistan continued her support in the war on terror as a frontline ally of the US despite all these hurdles and repercussions. A great diversity of ideology was visible in that phase but yet the coordination continued individually for their vested interests. In case of Pakistan its survival, security, economic dependence on the patron and for the US its geostrategic location for the use of land and aerial strikes. This mutuality of interests dominated the phenomenon of the client and patron relationship. It doesn't mean that ideological aspect was not given weightage but bilateral alliance continued because primary interests of the client and patron compromised the ideological divergence and proceeded onward with policy convergence in the post 9/11 era.

# Afghanistan-Pakistan Ideological Affinity and War on Terror

In the post-September scenario, the US started military campaign in Afghanistan and destroyed Taliban and Al-Qaeda forces and it considered victory of this war. The dust had started to settle but after the elections held in Pakistan and Mullahs returned to national and provincial houses legislature in unprecedented number in 2008 elections. Obviously, this was a vote against America and Musharraf and his pro-American policies. This vote announced a paradigm shift in the traditional equation of power in Pakistan. It was for the 1<sup>st</sup> time that Pakistani people

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>115</sup>C. Christine Fair and Peter Chalk, "United States Internal Security Assistance to Pakistan." Routledge Tailor and Francis Group, Vol. 17, No. 13, September (2006): 338.
<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

considered the mullah's best fit to rule over them. These mullahs perceived to have strong links with the fundamentalists. So many anti-American forces were emerging in Pakistan at that point of time. The way Musharraf mishandled the domestic politics and the way the United States campaign progressed in Iraq and Afghanistan, there left very few moderate and rest were tilted to the anti-American forces. However, despite all these tendencies and indicators, the silent majority in Pakistan wanted to have moderate and progressive state in the region. But the main problem was that this majority was silent. However, America and the Musharraf regime realized that Pakistan needed a democratic government for the success of war on terror.<sup>117</sup>

Pakistan as a Muslim state has strong ties and ideological affinities with Afghanistan. It also seems one of the reasons after the Soviet Union attack on Afghanistan it came to protect the neighbor Muslim state. Despite its strong alliance with the western capitalist block which wanted to contain the communism via Pakistan during the afghan war. Pakistan also wanted to discredit the influence of the Soviet Union in the region especially in Afghanistan to avoid any misadventure in the regional context. However, terrorist attacks totally changed the face of regional outlook of Pakistan foreign policy. Pakistan faced many challenges at domestic and international level due to historical ideological proximities with Afghanistan. Previously, Soviet Union had established strong ties with Afghanistan but later on their influence decreased because Pakistan never wanted any kind of influence in the region due to their closeness with India.

Episode of Soviet Union ended along with the cold war and the United States appeared as a sole super power. New major power also wanted to have strong hold and influence in this region of the world so after the 9/11 attacks they got the opportunity to fulfill their whims and wishes. Pakistan was threatened by the patron to Stone Age if they don't comply with the demands of patron so a new era of relationship between Pakistan and the US emerged on the war on terror. Ideological affinities kept on back burner by Islamabad and decided to have policy affinities by taking a U-turn in their policy on Afghanistan. World politics in the post 9/11 phase saw unique dynamics of the foreign policies of the states in which states sometimes ignored the

117 Hassan Abbas, Pakistan's Drift into Extremism (New Delhi: Pentagon Press, 2005), 14.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>118</sup>Ahmed Rashid, *Pakistan on the Brink, the Future of Pakistan, Afghanistan and the West* (USA: Penguin Books, 2012), 52.

<sup>119</sup> ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>120</sup> Rasul Baksh Rais, *The Troubled State and Troubled Relations: Afghanistan and Pakistan After 9/11* (Karachi: University of Karachi Press, 2009), 17.

ideological affinities with other states for their dire vested interests usually in case of dependent states same is the case with Pakistan.

However, the US has the same ideology as their foreign policies to the states so they proceeded with it by aligning the Pakistan with their policy of war on terror. There is no different case scenario when Pakistan joined the patron war on terror for its security and survival by overtaking Afghanistan. Moreover, Pakistan close ties with Taliban brought serious implications for it in the post 9/11 scenario. The United States always continued to pressurize Pakistan to do more in the war on terror. The United States violated the territorial boarders of Pakistan in the hot pursuit of terrorist. Pakistan launched operations in Swat and Waziristan against the extremist elements to convince the patron for its role to curb terrorism. However, still there are voices in the circles of Washington policy makers that Pakistan is protecting the Taliban and not conducting operation against them. Pakistan never becomes non-compliant to the patron due to its ideological factor but because of her vested strategic interests. 121

Trends have been changing in the world politics same is the case in the Pakistan-US cliental relations that are still having a strong security alliance despite the ideological divergence on the part of both the states. National interests, security and survival have over-empowered the element of ideology. Cliental relation is considered as a strong if both the partners have ideological affinities against the common enemy and common opposition but here the case is very unique in its nature and need to uncover the changing dynamics of client-patron relationship. It seems obvious from the fact that ideology is placed on secondary position in cliental strategic partnership. While taking into the consideration of Afghanistan case scenario where patron is using carrot and sticks policy and sometimes asks for full services of client in terms of political, military and geo-strategic locations and reward economic aid and assistance along with weaponry sophistication assistance of the client. All the assistance and support is continued until client keep on supporting the ideological, political and military polices of the patron. Loyalty and compliance to patron always pay back to the client.

It seems strange to see sometimes when Pakistan showed reluctance and non-compliance to the US ideological policies and all the support and assistance got suspended. It is pre-requisite for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>121</sup>Mutahir Ahmed, "Prospects of Islamic Fundamentalism." Pakistan Horizon, Vol. 48. No. 2, April (1995): 51.

the cliental relation to continue to have bilateral alliance whether cooperate or not on few issues. It seems quite accurate in case of Islamabad and Washington relations, on many occasions contradiction occurred and a vacuum was created but alliance remained constant.

States some times disagree wholly with the policies of patrons when there is a question of great threat to their security, sovereignty, territorial integrity and violation of human rights by the patron. Pakistan took stern action against the territorial violation and attacked on the security troops that were an acute violation of their sovereignty by blocking the NATO supply lines and compelled partner to ensure the clients interests in the region. Circumstances in global politics has changed now Pakistan is having close bilateral relations with China that is completely opposite of the Washington ideological goals but now they are pursuing the independent policy in which states are individually treated and relation with one state don't affect the relations with other states. There are two reasons behind it.

The trends of global politics and politics of alliances are changing with the emergence of new phenomenon of regionalism. Secondly, a patron has to compromise the non-compliant behavior of the client when they cooperate on the most critical issue to the patron. Undoubtedly, Pakistan is pursuing independent policy and having bilateral relations with China and developing cordial relations with Russia but didn't left supporting and serving the America with full-fledged power in the success of war on terror as it is quite clear that to win the war on terrorism without Pakistan is almost impossible.

The complexity of geo-strategic location of this region of the world is also making the political dynamics more complex. So cliental relations are also transforming from one stage to another because non-compliant behavior of the client sometimes transform this relation to the stage of estrange clientage in case of Pakistan and the United States strategic partnership with the changing prospects of the interstates relations. Pakistan has compromised her ideology and sovereignty for its economic stability and lost almost 65 billon dollars thousands of casualities along with 4000 army personnel martyreded. Apparently, a respectable survival in the eyes of the world but after the continuous double standards of Washington a transformation is occurring, so,

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

the relationship between Islamabad and Washington is shifting to new dimensions of the cliental political relations. 123

## Pakistan-US Ideological Affinity or Disparity in the Post 9/11 Era

Ideological perspective has been prevailing during the cold-war when big powers were in search of alliances in post British colonial period. In the post world war two big powers were searching the client states to make their blocks stronger by having political support of these small states. Ideological affinities were very relevant in this phenomenon during that period of time. However, with the disintegration of Soviet Union ideology became less relevant and decreased its weightage at the end of cold war. Many other emerging phenomenons dominated the arena of global politics like security and survival and it was on the prime agenda of the states at the time. Every state seeks to ensure its security and survival 1<sup>st</sup> and other interests are given secondary weightage.

So far as the concern of Pakistan-US alliance it was never an ideological alliance rather security oriented and interests based strategic partnership. Despite a large scale opposition to the support of capitalist ideology Pakistan government favored the American's ideology. Pakistan supported the ideological objectives of the patron state during the cold war to gain its own vested interests. One can say that during cold war cooperation there was an ideological relevance between the client and patron but later on it became totally irrelevant. The US a leader of capitalist block promotes its own ideology of capitalism to have a strong grip on the economic and political realms as compare to its contender. On the other hand, Pakistan is torch-bearer of Muslim concept of ideology that seems more relevant to the socialism. It is one of the main themes of client-patron relationship that the stakes of the patron are given more importance while client's stakes have less weightage in this regard.

So despite ideological divergence both the client and patron state managed to work together as strategic partners in the war on terror. However, Pakistan built close ties with the socialist China despite its alliance with the west and the US in war on terror. In the post cold war decade Pakistan was left helpless and Pakistan was searching for other partners. However, in case of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>123</sup>Bruce Riedel, *Deadly Embrace-Pakistan*, *America and Future of Global Jihad* (Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, 2001), 124.

Afghanistan it was following the policy of pro-Taliban because of their political and ideological affiliations with the Taliban. Pakistan shifted from its ongoing policy despite all its repercussion and implications to support the western bloc and combat the war on terror. Pentagon had threatened the very existence of Pakistan and survival was at stake in case of non-compliance. So security and survival was the primary objective and secondly it was economically dependent on the west.

By taking into account all the factors Pakistan joined the western ideology and policy and left its own ideology and policy priorities on the backburner. It is the long tradition of the Unites States that they always link the ideology with their foreign policy. The role of ideology can be discussed in terms of foreign policy of the United States. In this way this dimension of ideology can be justified or challenged whether this policy converge and have affinity with the client state Pakistan or not. So the policy apparatus followed by the US in the post 9/11 phase have a close link to their ideology and belief so this convergence of policy or affinity can be regarded as an ideological affinity keeping in view the previous record of the US to link their ideology with their foreign policy.

In cliental relationship the patron can force the client state to follow or comply with the patron's policy and if client don't agree than punished with the economic embargoes and military assistance for a longer period of time and all the diplomatic and policy matters support is given up by the patron. It is quite visible in the historical relationship of both the strategic partners Pakistan and the US. Pakistan was completely dependent on the US for economic and military aid and after complete cost-benefit analysis it decided to continue the cooperation to combat terrorism along America as a front line ally. It can be said that Pakistan was compelled to become a frontline ally in the war on terror and made affinities with their policies against war on terrorism in Afghanistan.<sup>124</sup>

Pakistan not only provided services to America militarily but also diplomatically by supporting their stances on the issues related to it. Tough Pakistan is fully supporting the policies of the US with whole of its capacity for the lead of the Washington in the competitive political environment. But externally this alliance is taken differently by different countries. New Delhi

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

has different perception of Pakistani role in the war on terror as a front line ally while Beijing see it through different lenses and Russia perceived this relationship in their own way because of its unique nature in the world politics.

## US Imperialistic and Ideological Goals

An inherent mission of the America is to realize the world and make itself greatest of all nations. When American policy makers confront those who oppose its ideological stance to dominate the world and try to convert them according to its interests however, make alliances with those who get convinced with its racial, cultural and systematic superiority in the world. When this is impossible and foreign powers threatened the value system of the United States, or the states that have been converted to its system, then repression necessarily tried. The use of force may be a less just mean for extending American empire than evangelism, but it is part of puritan complex ways to deal with the world. When the United States was in its embryonic stage, isolation was sensible policy. But when a country gets stronger it can easily convert her neighbor and the world into its ideology. But when these efforts failed, American policy makers felt it to be not just only justified, but benevolent, to impose conversion to the American by force. 126

The imperialism became model for American expansionism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century when the United States was not concerned with acquiring the territory, or settling American abroad to create new states, but has been concerned with establishing a military presence in a vast territory outside the United States. The United States has always been willing to use military force against weaker states, even those far away, to protect American economic and strategic interests. The liberal trade policy which the United States supported always with its military might reflects the American destiny by foreign policy makers as having objective of economic monoply over the world.

American destiny is to spread capitalistic ideology to the entire world. The American destiny would see the United States extending protestant Christianity or democratic government to entire world would be one that would pre-dominate among American foreign policy makers. Thus, from 1776 to 1945, American foreign policy can be thought out revolved around, 'The rise of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>125</sup>Usama Butt and Julian Schofield. *Pakistan the US, Geo-Politics and Grand Strategies*. (London: Pluto Press, 2012), 33.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid.

liberal empire' founded upon American foreign policy system<sup>127</sup>. The American diplomatic history has been the major source of knowledge that American foreign policy makers had about how to deal with the world. However, American destiny remained the dominant factor of American diplomatic history until the Twentieth century.

Many realists argue that after the world war two, the United States policy makers would have to be anti-communist because after the world war only Soviet Union was a real challenge to the America because the Soviets were the communist so it was a sufficient cause to be anti-Soviets. Despite the United States pledge to restore freedom and democracy worldwide, its commitment to promote democracy is limited by its perceived interests in different parts of the region. The American association with the dictators is often accused of fanning terrorist threat. The review of history of relations between Pakistan and the US and dynamics of power politics have the quality of those relations show that later have delimited by number of times by balance of power and balance of threat. However, the objective have been to keep those regions stable which where the America and its allies have strategic interests. In the post 9/11 phase the America focused on the ideology based on promotion of democracy to win the war on terror. It is commonly believed that defeating the terrorism is easy where democracy prevails. They contended that free nations would not give rise to terrorism but are more prone to cooperation and peace with other nations. The freedom became the top most agenda of the United States policy in the age of global war on terrorism.

The promotion of democracy emerged as a new tactic for the promotion of its vested interests and strategic designs by the United States. The US foreign policy in the wake of global war on terror has remarkably directed towards the strengthening of relations with the authoritarian regimes like Pakistan. The US decision makers describe relationships with the dictators just like Pakistan's Musharraf who continually involved in anti-democratic and human rights violations referred as a 'necessary alliance.' However, the card of jehadism has been used by the Musharraf to avoid the questions on their human rights violation records. However, officials seemed

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

convinced with the efforts made by this strategic ally to lead the country to the democratic transition. 128

The Great power politics do not subscribe to the book of rationality, they are shaped by the desired to assert, maintain and expand hegemony and the United Sates is no exception from this. The states make alliances to counter the threats just like they make alliances to counter the power. So considering Al-Qaeda a serious threat to the security of the United States and its interests in the outer world, the relations between the America and the Military dictator in Pakistan is an alliance against the threat so it is defined in balance of threat strategies.

So Al-Qaeda wanted to upset this balance of power stratagem with the just cause as they believe that they are trying to save the world from the cruelities of the super power oppression. America also retaliated in the same manner by making a just reason to maintain the balance as a sole superpower status. 129 Ideological dimension of the cliental relations is quite unique and important one because Washington wanted to proliferate to the capitalistic ideology with the support of its clients throughout the world to maintain its superpower status, with its strong hold on the economic system of the world. It will be only possible if its capitalistic ideology dominates all over the world and it will control all the resources by bringing them under its influence. Religious dimension is also relevant on the part of patron state because it wanted the domination of Christian civilization as a core foreign policy objective idea that was mainly described by the Huntington and wanted to make subordinate to the Muslim ideology.

Moreover, Islamabad can play significant role in the ideological domination of the Washington by joining the capitalistic block headed by the United States. Islamabad joined the strategic alliance despite diverging ideologies perhaps for the promotion of capitalistic ideology not in the religious dimension just to preserve its security, political and economic interests. Usually, small states join those stronger states with whom they have ideological affinity and this aspect makes this cliental relationship very strong. In the case study of Islamabad and Washington both the partners have diverging ideologies but are still on the level of certain cooperation because they have other vested interests that are affiliated with this strategic partnership individually in terms

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>128</sup>Usama Butt and Julian Schofield. *Pakistan the US, Geo-Politics and Grand Strategies*. (London: Pluto Press, 2012). 32.

<sup>129</sup> Khadim Hussain, The Militant Discourse (Islamabad: BPH Publisher, 2013), 60.

of security, economic and other socio-cultural ties. Islamabad's stakes are of more significance attached with this partnership of cliental relations. On the other hand, patron has the long tradition of linking ideology with its foreign policy as it is evident by the world keeping in view its historical background. In this realm both the states are on the policy of convergence despite diverging beliefs because America is pursuing its ideological-cum foreign policy throughout the world to ensure peace and democracy. The client is supporting the patron's ideology despite divergence however, other factors seems more significant having greater weigtage in this realm of strategic environment.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

This chapter focuses on the multiple aspects of the enigmatic relationship between Pakistan and the United States along with its regional and global dynamics. It also argues the dynamics of foreign policy of Pakistan in the post 9/11 scenario. It further argues that Islamabad policy making mainly based on the security factor vis-à-vis Washington in this phase and this point justified Pakistan as a security state.

Moreover, for its geo-strategic location Pakistan is very important for the US in the war on terror in Afghanistan. Obviously, America realizes that it is almost impossible to win the war on terror without the cooperation of Pakistan due to its strong bonds with the state. On the other hand, the United States extended all the support and assistance to the partner purely for their strategic and national interests at the regional and broader spectrum. The United States wanted to utilize Pakistan to curb the menace of terrorism due to its strategic location as they used it during the cold war for the containment of the Soviet Union.

It also argues that there are multiple disparities, divergence of interests, distrust and sense of suspicion exists between the partners but geo-strategic and security compulsions bring both the partners in the same block to go ahead as strategic partner. It also discusses the policy shift in the US foreign policy in the post 9/11 due to the terrorist attack on the Pentagon. So Islamabad again became the most allied ally of America in the war on terror and all the sanctions imposed lifted and aids started to get compliant policy and services in the war on terror. This military alliance opened up new horizons of cooperation between the strategic allies and it might change the nature of relationship in near future if the current policies of the patron continued.

## Security Oriented Military Alliance in Pakistan-US Relations 2001-2010

In the post 9/11 phase many new security challenges emerged in global and regional politics by bringing plenty of paradigms forthwith. South Asian regions have been major point of concern for the western world in general and the United States in particular. The world draw its attention towards this volatile region in the post September 11, 2001 and new dimensions of alliances and cooperation came on the frontline irrespective of that this cooperation and aligning revolves around security threats, security challenges and survival. The dynamics of world politics changed altogether in this new era of conflict and cooperation. The terrorist attacks on the Americans

Afghanistan. The United States immediately warned the world to cooperate fully on their part to combat this menace of terrorism. Pakistan showed full cooperation and got aligned with America in the war on terror. So this was a new era of military cooperation and security alliance between Islamabad and Washington which were going to cooperate reciprocally for each other concerns. Pakistan as a weak state and a client joined this venture for couple of significant reasons and assured all out cooperation to eradicate this curse of terrorism from gross root level from the region and the world at large. Islamabad and Washington emerged as strong strategic partners on this war on terror to bring peace and security in the world.<sup>130</sup>

The events of 9/11 led to the categorical shift in the international relations especially for the justification of military intervention in other sovereign states internal affairs. This raised severe criticism on the viability of international law, however, there is no mentioned in law to intervene in a sovereign state militarily and counter non-state actors when that state is not sponsoring those actors. However, this act of intervention was a grave violation of norms and rules of international law in Iraq and Afghanistan. There is no denying the fact that this war on terror has affected social, economic, political and security conditions in Pakistan to a great extent. Pakistan in terms of security and stability has become vulnerable during the phase of this war on terrorism. The United States has repeatedly violated the sovereignty of Pakistan in this regard to pursue its nefarious strategic designs in the regional context by subduing Pakistan to act according the wishes of the partner.

There is no doubt about it that Islamabad is fighting against war on terror on all the fronts opened by the Washington to achieve its aim in the region but ironically many issues like drone attacks in the tribal areas of Pakistan are breeding more terrorists who ultimately gets involved in the terrorist attacks everywhere in the state by bringing severe implications for the country. Resultantly, war on terror is bringing severe implication for Pakistan's security and stability.<sup>131</sup>

Therefore, due to the changing regional and global scenario, Pakistan compelled to join the US led alliance in the war to combat terrorism. Islamic parties developed anti-American sentiments

<sup>131</sup> M. J. Akbar, *Tinderbox- The Past and Future of Pakistan* (New Delhi: HarperCollins, 2011), 313.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>130</sup>David O. Smith, "Facing upto the Trust-Deficit: the key to Enhanced US-Pakistan Defense Relationship." Strategic Insights, Center for Contemporary Studies, Vol. 6, Issue 4 (2007): 3.

so won many seats in the elections. Pakistan deployed more than 140,000 soldiers in north and South Waziristan. However, almost 4000 have martyred in this conflict<sup>132</sup>. Pakistan has suffered disastrous effects in all spheres of life and sectors due to the war on terror. The economic condition was expected to improve but the situation is continuously deteriorating in the country. Pakistan has suffered an irreparable loss in the war on terror in terms of human life. It is estimated that Pakistan lost almost 40,000 thousand persons including 5000 security troops in this war on terror. <sup>133</sup> There seems no solution to this terrorism menace or the attacks. Drone attacks take place on the people of Pakistan bordering Afghanistan for presumed terrorist hideouts. Pakistan security forces conducting operations in the tribal areas there is a great loss of life due to this. Resultantly suicide attacks are taking place every knock and corner of the country in retaliation. There is a continuous threat perception and psychological pressure in the minds of the Pakistani peoples along with the great economic and human lives loss.

However, element of security was main point of concern for both the parties at this juncture in this new era of security and politics in the global politics. On the part of Pakistan, this alliance was for security and survival of the state to avoid destabilization while, on the American part, Al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations was a potential threat, to eradicate these terrorist organizations military alliance was inevitable with Pakistan military because it was impossible to win war on terror without the cooperation of Pakistan. The United States revised her relations with the client state and reaffirmed her full assurance for security and stability against the potential threats to Pakistan. In this way, a strong alliance of security and cooperation established between Pakistan and the United states.

In a client and patron relationship asymmetry exists between the military capabilities of client and patron and obviously client plays a significant role in the competition of patron. Both of these factors are perfectly fit in the military alliance of Pakistan and the America. There is no denying the fact that asymmetry in military capabilities, economic dependence and sense of compliance on all the critical issues make weak state a client state and patron take benefit out of it in her competition with the rival states. Another very vital aspect in this relationship is the perception of the external world. The alliance of Pakistan and the United States perceived very

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>132</sup>M. J. Akbar, *Tinderbox- The Past and Future of Pakistan* (New Delhi: HarperCollins, 2011), 313.

strong at regional level so it creates deterrence stability. For Pakistan it creates deterrence for India while for the US it creates deterrence against the terrorist elements. So, all the pre-requisites are present there that make this cliental relationship very strong and unique in nature in the world politics of alliances and collective defense.

## Security Perspective in Cliental Relationship

National Security is of two type; one is of military strength while the other economic security. Security of a state is the ability to protect its national interests by being sovereign while interacting with other states. It is quite obvious in the sense as absolute security cannot be achieved; absolute sovereignty can also not achieve. This is quite right that sovereignty of a nation is determined by its economic and military strength. Economically weak state would be less sovereign and more vulnerable. Security perspective is also very important in cliental political relations. Both the states wanted to maintain their vital national interests in any case. However, less important interests changes with the changing political environment.

In the cliental relationship, Patron guarantees the client's security in return of compliance and cooperation and transfer arms to the client rather declaration or direct intervention. This aspect in Pakistan-US relationship seems suspicious and doubtful by taking into account the historical experience of relationship between both the states. However, this time America assures that it would be different so no need to worry about it but yet it is to be decided. Although, in cliental relationship security of the client is ensured by the patron but the autonomy of the client is violated by the patron. Though cliental relationship exists between both the parties but vital concern has been security. <sup>134</sup>

Pakistan-US relations always lacked the continuity as both the sides always had conflicting goals and different objectives. For Pakistan its security, survival in troubled and hostile regional environment and its relations with India have been overriding policy goals for its relations with the United States. The American interests on the hand, has always been focused on its regional and global interests. In the aftermath of 9/11 Pakistan is fulfilling its obligations to make the world a safer place while the US has created a great strategic imbalance in the region by entering

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>134</sup>Muhammad Waqas Sajjad, "External Factors of Instability in the Pakistan-Troubled Alliances in War." *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad*, September (2009): 9.

a long-term military and nuclear deal with India and remained least concerned to Pakistan's security concerns. This also triggered this concept in the mind of Pakistan's that the Unites States is not a consistent and reliable ally. And Washington never wanted to restore peace and stability in the South Asian region, having the lack of Sincerity with Islamabad. Since the beginning Pakistan foreign policy based on two factors its security and territorial integrity. It always has to respond to the exceptional environment and challenges in this hostile environment of the region. Pakistan has to be vigilant of its neighboring states and external world, so it has to define its foreign policy based on its strategic environment and security situations.

Pakistan's external world relations since the very beginning of its inception based on three factors. Pakistan has a quest for security and survival as an independent state of the worl. Pakistan has continuous troubled relations with its neighboring country India. Pakistan's over reliance on the west for its political, economic and military survival. Pakistan strategic alliance with the United States is start of another chapter of political history. In a very short time, Pakistan became a battleground for the war on terror and paid a heavy price in terms of human and material loss until today. Though, Musharraf government managed to secure its image in the eyes of the world but faced a severe reaction from religious and Islamist organizations. Musharraf was the first external leader to receive the call from Washington and asked by the secretary Colin Powel, 'you are with us or against us' was the message and asked for full support and cooperation in the war against terrorism. <sup>135</sup>

The options were very limited so it was decided to cooperate with the United States in the war on terror. The scene of the world politics in terms of global relations had changed overnight. Musharraf regime didn't choose the wrong side and become a frontline ally in the US-led war against terrorism. However, this quick and surprised U-turn in the established polices of Pakistan surprised even the United States because she was not expecting that their all demands would be approved without on a single threat. As a battleground of this war, Pakistan could not avoid the effects of this war in the form of heavy toll on its already volatile socio-economic environment as a result of violence and instability. The United States lifted all the previous bans and provided economic and military support to Pakistan. A large amount of economic support started flowing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>135</sup>Ashley J. Tellis, "Pakistan- Conflicted Ally in the War on Terror." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Policy Brief No. 56, December (2012): 7.

from Washington to Islamabad and in 2004 Bush administration declared it a non-NATO ally that was more of symbolic than practical.

The post 9/11 scenario made Afghanistan and Pakistan a hotbed of religious extremism and terrorism at large. This not only made it focal point but also drawn the world attention and cause anxiety increment. Such circumstances forced it to make difficult choices in its pursuit of security and survival as independent states. Pakistan is the only Muslim country with an ongoing military operation against its own people. It brought US-led war on terror on its own territory by violating its own sovereignty. Now Pakistan is involved in a full scale war against its own people in the tribal areas by deploying large chunk of its forces in this problematic regional belt and facing continuous attacks on its security forces as a reaction. Two countries are the battlefield of the war on terrorism while Islamabad is acting as a frontline state on the war on terror and playing its role to eradicate the war on terror. Afghanistan has proved an unfortunate state in the post- Soviet era.

Had the United States not pulled away the military and economic support immediately after the afghan war the condition might have been different. If the attention has been paid by the world then the kind of circumstances might not have erupted. Now the role what the Pakistan and Afghanistan are required to play to make the world a safer place must be conditioned with the regional social, economic and political and security environment of South Asia. 136

## US Security Policy Perspective in Post 9/11 Era

Bush administration continued all the policies of the Clinton with special emphasis on the engagement with South Asia. However, terrorist attacks brought a significant change in the quality and intensity of the American engagement in South Asia. Republicans view Pakistan in US foreign policy debates almost entirely in terms of terrorist threat post by the Islamic forces to international community, to the United States and the stability of Pakistan. However, a broader perspective is ignored by the super power that survival and security of the Pakistan is almost impossible without political and economic reforms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>136</sup>The U.S.-Pakistan Relationship: Toward a complementary Strategy, *the National Strategy Forum*, Vol. 20, Issue 2 (2011): 5. www.nationalstrategy.com

After the September terrorist attacks the United States got involved in relations with both the South Asian states. Washington tried to build tactical partnership with Islamabad and strategic relationship with the India on the offer of both of these states. However, both of these relations faced uncertainty. Pakistan was economically vulnerable, politically unstable and increasingly Islamic state perceived by the Unites States as a troubling one. While sharing many strategic interests with India, the United States faced many frictions in its relations with Pakistan. 9/11 incident not only changed the trends of global politics but also transformed the dynamics of regional security in South Asia. The terrorist attacks on pentagon and world trade center turned down the US policy upside down with its direct intervention in other states by violating international law and brought Pakistan on the central stage in the war on terror. As a well known south Asian scholar Stephen P. Cohen said, "No part of the world has been affected by the terrorist attacks more than South Asia." The national security strategy to South Asia issued by the US administration in September, 2002 when Washington indicated that it would invest time and resources for the strong ties with Pakistan and India and mentioned that Pakistan- United States relations has been strengthened with the choice of Pakistan in the war on terror.

White house also explained that the India would become one of the biggest powers of the world in twentieth century and we have transformed our relations accordingly. Both the relationships faced uncertainty and are asymmetrical. Though, partnership between Islamabad and Washington evolved in a single dimension but there exist many points of divergence in this bilateral partnership of client and patron. Even in counter terrorism campaign Pakistan and the US seems many time conflicting in their goals. However, Indian-US strategic partnership was a goal that two nations set few years back based on the broader common interests. Secondly, campaign on terrorism is primary if not the sole reason of this strategic partnership.

The US assistance in terms of military and economy is bound to their action on the tribal areas however; it can be lethal for Pakistan and creating security dilemma in the region by worsening the situation in Pakistan as it would not be without heavy economic, political and military cost. Despite all this Pakistan would remain a close strategic ally of the US as there is an opinion in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>137</sup> Zhang Guihong, "US security policy towards south Asia after September 11<sup>th</sup> and its implications for China: A Chinese Perspective." *DuPont Circle*, Washington, January (2003): 13. <a href="https://www.stimpson.org">www.stimpson.org</a>. Accessed on 1/4/2010. <sup>138</sup> Stephen P. Cohen, *India: Emerging Power* (Washington D.C.: The Brooking institution press, 2002), xiii.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>139</sup> The national security strategy Report of the Unites States, the White house, September, 2002, 10.

Washington that a stable Pakistan would bring peace and security in the regional security. The partners had a workable relationship in their operation against the Taliban, however, points of disagreements started to emerge when both the client and patron move to the North Western boarder of Pakistan, continuous terrorist's attacks occurred that deteriorated the situation. The US defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld said America considered ties with Pakistan "long," "strategic" and "mutually beneficial," he added that to look forward to strengthen it in variety of ways." Pakistan also worries about the US close ties with India in the post 9/11 scenario. Pakistani leaders and policy makers are anxious on the sale of military arsenals to India and a civil nuclear cooperation deal with the Indian government. The effects of war on Iraq and its aftereffects are viewed as anti-Pakistan and anti-Islamic actions is a point of concern for Pakistan due to its suspicion on the US for the solution of Kashmir issue that is a matter of great significance for establishment of the Pakistan. 141

## Shift of Security Paradigms in the US foreign Policy in Post 9/11 Events

It is quite obvious that for the US, 9/11 attacks were not only world politics changing events but world thinking changing events. As the terrorism emerged as a threat to the interests of the US so its security paradigms have shifted from great power militaries and huge industrial bases to the failing states. Now its main concern is less developed, almost isolated and military insignificant state which is considered as a involvement state sponsoring terrorism and a state sponsored by the terrorists. It made the Americans ample clear that foreign policy which was the prerogative of the sovereign states since the past days now has become the agenda of rouge outfits like Al-Qaeda. 142

During the mobilization of their army on the Afghanistan George W. Bush categorically mentioned that though this war is starting from Afghanistan but it would not remain confined to it. War is starting from the Afghanistan but the nations of the world should not mistake the intentions of the United States. This war would not stop unless the entire terrorist found, stopped, and defeated and nations of the world should not allow to harbor and support the terrorist within

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>140</sup> "U.S.-Pak Strategic Relationship: Rumsfeld," Rediff.com news, February 14, 2002, available at <a href="https://www.rediff.com/news/2002/february/14uspak.htm">www.rediff.com/news/2002/february/14uspak.htm</a>, accessed on 25/03/2010

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>141</sup> Polly Nayak, "US Security Policy in South Asia Since 9/11- Challenges and Implications for the Future." *Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies* (APCSS), February (2005): 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>142</sup> Ahmed Faruqui, *Musharraf's Pakistan*, and *Bush's America and the Middle East* (Lahore: Banquet Printing Press, 2008), 26.

their boarders. No nation can be neutral in this conflict because no civilized nation can be secure from this threat of terrorism. 143 'Our enemy is radical groups of terrorists and every government that supports them'. 144

So far as the US security policy concerns in South Asia, the US has infirm terms with Pakistan, having failed to slow down its nuclear programme and stop its support to the Taliban. The United States made the South Asia an initial theatre for the combat on terrorism. The most visible effect of this policy was the arrival of the security forces in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is reality that war on terrorism has affected the Afghanistan and Pakistan; perhaps Islamabad presents tougher challenge to the United States security policy. Since 9/11 Pakistan has moved from the containment to one of the re-engagement with US. Pakistan cooperation with the United States has grown persistently since the Pakistan became the member of this coalition.

Though, the Musharraf coalition with the United States as many take it ending the country's isolation as a result of sanctions imposed. It also brought aid for Pakistan as previously it was given on the human grounds that are now being given to prevent the terrorism as it is given in the shape of first security aid of 9 billion and later on in form of Kerry Lugar bill consisting of 1.5 billion dollar each year. 145

Many sanctions were lifted that were imposed on Pakistan like pressler amendment, in the post 9/11 phase so many of the US military supplies were to counter the terrorism. Whatever may be the gains there are many losses of lining with the United States and the client is much concerned that Pakistan would be left alone when priorities of the United States changed. The war on terrorism moved to Pakistan areas because Taliban members pushed to take hide in Pakistani areas. The war on terror has put the relations of Pakistan at odds because there is no solution to the Kashmir dispute; it is point of great concern for Pakistani authorities because Washington always avoided taking the side of Kashmiris. According to the Stephen p. Cohen, Pakistan-US relations are defined in term of partial nature, asymmetry and perceptual distortions. <sup>146</sup> For

146 Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>143</sup> These remarks made by the George W. Bush at the Warsaw conference on combating terrorism, 6 November 2001. www.whitehouse.gov. Accessed on 27/9/2009.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>144</sup> From an address delivered by George W. Bush at a joint session of congress and American people, Washington D.C., 20 September 2001. www.whitehouse.gov. Accessed on 25/23/2010.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>145</sup> Ahmed Faruqui, *Musharraf's Pakistan*, and Bush's America and the Middle East (Lahore: Banquet Printing Press, 2008), 24.

Pakistan India has been great threat to its security as compare to the US strategic objectives in the region. Security has been the key agenda between both the states that brought them closer to each other; however, there is a great diversity in core interests of both the allies. From 1950's to 1980's, US were more concerned to the Soviet invasion as compare to Pakistan while Pakistan was restricted to the security threat from India. Security relations are also asymmetrical as this partnership is more important for Pakistan as compare to the United States.

## Pakistan-US Military Cooperation in the War on Terror

The event of 9/11 brought a cover of legitimacy to Musharraf regime. It was very hard time for the Musharraf to persuade in the war on terrorism because it was already suffering from this menace. Prior to this event Pakistan was receiving less aid mainly because of sanctions imposed as a punishment for acquiring the nuclear weapons. In the wake of 9/11, Pakistan shifted its policy from pro- Taliban and this brought reversal in the United States sanctions. The economic relations got boast in this face to this extent that some people started criticizing the amount of aid packages to Pakistan, especially the coalition support fund (CSF) a programme to compensate Pakistan. It was because Pakistan's geo-strategic importance was quite clear to the US for the operation enduring freedom (OEF) to destroy Al-Qaeda and to overthrow the Taliban.

In 2002, Pakistan provided five air bases and allowed to land the planes anywhere in case of emergency and provided two-third of its air space as an air corridor and for this purpose redirected many commercial flights. Naval facilities were also provided, as coalition forces landed at Pasni. Over 330 vehicles and 1350 tons of equipment unloaded here and sent from Pasni to Kandahar. Undoubtedly, it was the foolproof security arrangement by the Pakistan security agencies that no security lapse occurred during these operations around the bases. Along with this several Al-Qaeda leaders were arrested because of support of the Pakistan intelligence agencies support with CIA and other coalition forces. In the war on terror, 1st ever major operation was conducted by Pakistan in 2001 in which 240 Al-Qaeda operatives belonging to different countries were captured. So it remained a largest catch in a single anti-terrorism catch in which so large operatives of Al-Qaeda were arrested since the 2001.

<sup>148</sup> Pervaiz Musharaff, In the Line of Fire, A Memoir (New York: Free Press, 2006), 264.

<sup>147</sup> Leon T. Hadar, "Pakistan in America's War Against Terrorism." Policy Analysis, No. 436, May 2 (2002): 3.

Pakistan provided too much support, captured many terrorists and deployed troop's at large scale more than any other ally in the US led counter-terrorism war. According to the Pakistan foreign embassy officials, Pakistan conducted almost 38 major operations to capture the terrorists till 2005. Thousands of Pakistan military officials killed or injured in the war against terrorism. It banned many terrorist organizations and established anti-terrorist laws to control the terrorism. In return, Pakistan has received assistance in terms of economic and military, the US rescheduled the billions of dollars debt and approved series of loans. <sup>149</sup> One of the contentious issues which Pakistan encountered in the wake of 9/11 was madrassa support in the resurge of the Taliban in Afghanistan. Pakistan clarified the international community in general and the US in particular that these madrassa students had nothing to do with the Taliban or Al-Qaeda, however, western always raised the fingers of suspicion in this regard and it is still contentious.

The war on terrorism has not moved with the same pace as was anticipated by the US. Regardless of Pakistan role in the war on terror the relations between Islamabad and Washington are deteriorating. Previously, Bush administration had been pressing Pakistan to do more and now the Obama administration has not changed the policies to any large extent. Sometimes, it seems by most of the political scholars that it is the continuation of the policies of the previous Bush government. Pakistan is threatened to do more on extremism and terrorism or ready to face the challenges for non-cooperation in terms of economic aid suspension. Both the client and patron perceive each other indispensable. But the relations between both the states have been continuously towards the downward spiral. <sup>150</sup>

The drone attacks in all over the Pakistan international boarder line under the existing international law are not justified anyway. These drone attacks leading to the growth of more terrorists which strike back in Pakistan cities as a reaction of their human loss in these attacks. These drone attacks are assisting the Taliban in one way because majority of causalities occurs are of the civilians. This is in tribal areas tradition that the relatives of whose dies in the drone attacks take revenge from the aggressor. In this way many new terrorist created and all such situation exploited by the terrorist outfits and they indoctrinate such lone surviving teenagers.

<sup>149</sup> Christine fair, "The Counter terror Coalitions: Cooperation with Pakistan and India." *United States Institute of Peace*, August (2005): 5-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>150</sup> Syed Muhammad Ali shah, "Pakistan and the war against terrorism." *Pakistan institute of international affairs*, Pakistan horizon, Vol. no. 6, no.2, Pakistan foreign policy analysis (2007): 85-107. <a href="www.jstor.org">www.jstor.org</a>. Accessed on: 23/05/2013.

They attacked on the US forces and Pakistan security agencies in the revenge. Pakistan military is supporting the US led war on terror and when these drone attacks take place so loss of human life occur. No one, no where in Pakistan is safer. The US influence to contain Afghanistan resistance led them to blame Pakistan for sponsoring the terrorism. The Obama administration moved to the reconciliation by realizing the critical role of Pakistan in the withdrawal strategy of the US from Afghanistan.

Pakistani society is facing collateral damage due to the increasing number of suicide attacks. Pakistan has put enormous efforts to curb the terrorism and extremism. In this regard, Pakistan faced many challenges and conducted many operations to counter the menace of extremism and terrorism from Pakistan. However, militants responded with the suicide attack in reaction of these operations on a large scale.<sup>151</sup> The entire adolescent are indoctrinated and incited by the Taliban because security forces in Pakistan helping the US drone attacks in Pakistan so it is not wrong to inflict attacks on the forces as a result a large scale causalities of innocent and civilians occur.

## Military Assistance: A Myth or Reality

Pakistan being a client state always provided assistance and aid packages from the US when it needed the most whether it is the time of cold war period or the Afghan war for their competition in their arch-rival Soviet Union or now to combat terrorism in the war on terror. Pakistan located at the key strategic location in the geo-politically most significant region of the world and most importantly in the neighborhood of the Soviet Union was always a desired ally of the US in the competition of the two superpowers. However, it would not be exaggeration to say that in the collapse of the Soviet Union, Pakistan played a key role during cold war era and in the Afghan war.

Undoubtedly, there were certain compulsions on the economically dependent and weak state in terms of political, economic and military support for the establishment of the stable and progressive state by having prestigious status in the eyes of the world. Above all, the element of insecurity perceived by the Indian side compells Pakistan to join the western block in the larger

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>151</sup>Umbreen Javed and Zulifqar Ali, "War on Terror Partnership: Problems and Prospects for Pakistan." *Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 20, issue-1 (2013): 18.

interests of the country. It would be quite right to mention here the ground reality that as Pakistan was most desired ally for the US in their competition same is the case with Islamabad as it desired to full her military needs with the aid of the America.

Another very significant factor in this regard is that the autonomy of Pakistan has always been violated by the superpower in the return of this military aid and threat to its integrity remains persistent. The economic and military assistance has always been extended to enhance the client states dependence to make subservient to its policies of interests. There is no denying the fact that these aids and assistance packages increased to get desired compliant behavior on the part of the client. However, at the completion of the required task with support of the client state, no more funds are provided because they are left of no use subsequently. In the post 9/11 phase after the terrorist attacks, from 2001 to 2010, the United States again encouraged its aid and fund packages for its key ally in the war on terror to get maximum support and subservience conduct.

The US sent almost 9 billion dollars as aid and funds to conduct the operations against the terrorists in the north-western regions along with the boarders of Afghanistan. Another, 3.6 billion dollars were provided for the economic and diplomatic support. In 2009, another assistance package was announced with the amount of 7.5 billion dollars in the five years period, annually sanctioned 1.5 billions as this transaction would complete in five years tenure.

Moreover, many reservations put forward if crack down of the militants would not complete it can be suspended so these reservations opened the gap between the strategic allies on the war on terror. Contrary to this, Pakistan's loss in the war on terror is 65 billion American dollars and aid provided by the US is very small as compare to the loss and spending by Pakistan. The economic losses Pakistan suffered in the war on terror are too heavy while comparing with the aid. The aid provided by Washington in the war on terror is 4 to 5 times smaller to the expenses exerted by the Pakistan as a strategic partner in the combat on terrorism. It is quite surprising to mention this reality that the Unites Stats has not only used Pakistan as a client state but also used it in their secret operations without taking into confidence the Pakistani leadership. Many of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>152</sup> Saeed Shafqat, "Pakistan and the United States: A Future unlike the Past." *Center for the Study of Pakistan*, Columbia University New York, March (2005): 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>153</sup> Saeed Shafqat, "Pakistan and the United States: A Future unlike the Past." Center for the Study of Pakistan, Columbia University New York, March (2005): 4.
<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

occasions the aid provided used as carrot and stick policy to get Pakistan's compliant behavior on any specific issue. Carrot has been the financial assistance provided while stick was a threat to curtail that aid anymore.

Unfortunately, Pakistan is going through its worst time due to the reliance of political leaders who have got addicted to their aid. The myth is that this aid has made the leaders addict of it who can do anything for the next dose of aid either that is in the shape of compromising on the sovereignty of the state. The cost-benefit analysis of the aid provided to Pakistan by the US is much smaller from the original expenses yet again Pakistan is supporting the war on terror or compelled to do it. This is very clear from this fact that Pakistan's security and survival is dominating its policy on the war on terror and towards the US. Pakistan as a client state is so reliant and dependent on the United States that it is fully trapped for its economic and security concerns. Keeping in view the cliental relationship in mind it is quite obvious that the relationship between both strategic allies is according to that, however, in this case scenario the clients rights are not being taken care of by the patron so it is expected it may lead to some extent to the transformation of this unique relationship.<sup>155</sup>

## Pakistan-US Nexus and future of Afghanistan

Pakistan-US strategic partnership is very important for the future of Afghanistan in a constructive way. It is almost impossible for the US to win the war on terror without Pakistan cooperation. The patron has realized the importance of the client in this strategic partnership on the war on terror that there is no replacement of Pakistan in the war to combat terrorism because of its geo-strategic location and political affiliation with the Afghanistan. The role of Pakistan in the neighbor state has been greater ever since the beginning. Furthermore, Pakistan can not remain aloof in the war because of certain geo-strategic compulsions at the regional and international level.

The United States has got the categorical achievement in Afghanistan due to the role of Pakistan at large. Pakistan has close social and geographic proximities with the neighboring state and this affiliation understood well by the United States. Previously, in the post Afghan war era when the patron left Pakistan in doldrums to face the implications of the war alone when it needed the US

<sup>155</sup> Sultan M Hali, "Pak-US turning relations," Pakistan Observer, Islamabad, May 20, 2001.

most, millions of refugees entered in the neighboring Pakistan and brought a lot of burden on the economy of the country. The condition might have been different if the US had not left the country in that miserable condition after the fall of Soviet Union. At that time, Pakistan was the only country which had to face the consequences after the end of cold war.

In the post 9/11 phase the patron once again came forward to make Pakistan a most allied ally in the war in Afghanistan. Pakistan has extended full support by capturing the Al-Qaeda top leaders in the beginning of the war in Afghanistan. As the US has realized that won-won game is impossible in Afghanistan so they have started dialogue process with Taliban and in this dialogue process Islamabad can play significant and decisive role by hosting the process and this reality is very well known by the United States. It has been continuously used by the US in the war on terror since the start of the war. There is no denying the fact as the war in Afghanistan can not be win without Pakistan same is the case with exist strategy of the US from the country. The role of Pakistan in the post withdrawal of the US forces from the region would be significant. It is pertinent to mention here that the US should stay in Afghanistan until its development and power sharing after the elections and should not repeat the past mistakes by leaving the country in the civil war like situation that would b devastating for country and the region in the long run.

However, Pakistan can play decisive role in its re-habilitation process of the war-ridden region. The client state would also be useful to establish peace and stability in the region after the withdrawal of the western forces. It would be only possible if the United States would continue funding for the development and stability of Afghanistan and power shifted peacefully to the Afghanis. This scheme will be only effective if external involvement is stopped and treated in a systematic way. The military alliance between Pakistan and the US would not only lead to win the war on terror but also in peace building with the Taliban for the peaceful exit of the western forces from the region if supported well. Pakistan would be the only country that can be more effective to make the Afghanistan a peaceful and democratic country in near future. It can also bring development and progress in the country in the post war scenario. So client would be a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>156</sup>Rizwan Hussain, Pakistan and Emergence of Islamic Militancy in Afghanistan (England: Asghate Publishing Company, 2005), 167.

key player in the development and rehabilitations of the Afghanistan if wise and cooperative strategy would be devised by Washington with the full cooperation of Islamabad.

## Policy Divergence in Pakistan-US Strategic Alliance

Pakistan and the United States relations have been strained and prospects to improve them were not great. However, the US came closer to Pakistan when needed most because of its geostrategic location in the volatile region of the world. There are many reasons why the relations between Islamabad and Washington have been strained since the US has always used Pakistan as a mean for achieving an end and always left it in doldrums after the achievement of the objective. During cold war Pakistan was in the western camp while after the cold war US dissociated itself from Pakistan and imposed sanctions against due to the continuation of its nuclear programme.

It is pertinent to mention here that feelings of a person are demonstrated in the shape of national sentiments and obviously that dissociation was hard to bear for Pakistan at that time. There is no denying the fact that this point proved to create anti-US sentiments. Later on, after the 9/11 attacks, Pakistan was dragged into the war on terror due to the forceful policies of the US making Pakistan the victim of the combat on terrorism.

Several other key events created suspicion and distrust between the two coordinators in the war on terror including the Abbottabad operation, Raymond Davis case incident and Salala incident. Though, after the Salala attacks the US apologized Pakistan but it could not change much about the relational nature between the two states. <sup>157</sup> In reaction to that Pakistan stopped the NATO supplies which later on resumed due to intense international pressure. Pakistan and the US relations are based on national interests while to serve Pakistan's interests is not quite convincing for it. In case of non-compliance behavior and non-cooperation in the war on terror, it has to face sanctions and embargoes by the white house. Keeping in view the new trends of world politics it is not possible for superpower to fool any state or can continue the policy of double-standards.

The people and the policy makers of Pakistan know very well that Pentagon has deceived them many times. Both the client and patron should understand the mutual interest of each other for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>157</sup> K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan-US Relation," Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, May 24, 2012, 1.

long term strategic alliance. It is significant for the US to understand the will of the people because the newly elected government would be following the will and wishes of the masses. So the drone attacks are no one's choice in Pakistan and it is high time to understand the Washington to stop these inhuman attacks to avoid the killing of innocents in Pakistan.<sup>158</sup>

If the Washington continues with the same pace of policies then it should be ready to face the opposition to these policies that are violating Pakistan's sovereignty continuously. This mistrust between Pakistan and US is prevailing due to wrong, interests based and event-oriented polices that could be detrimental to this strategic alliance in general and client-patron relation in particular. If the drone attacks did not stop then it would definitely lead to transformation of this relationship. Islamabad will demonstrate resistance, anger and non-compliance behavior on the policies of the United States if drone attacks continued. This shift can invite the wrath of the imperial partner resulting in the economic and military sanctions while continuous non-compliance behavior on the part of Islamabad can be detrimental to strategic partnership.

It can shift the relationship at the stage of estrange clientage that is quite visible in near future before the breakage of the client-patron strategic partnership. 159

Unless, some game changing steps are taken by both sides, the relationship between Islamabad and Washington would be leading towards serious downturn marked by the continuing distrust. The United States and Pakistan have different objectives while speaking about common goals, Pentagon wanted to have peaceful military exit from the Afghanistan with no causalities while ensuring that Al-Qaeda would not emerge again. On the other hand, Pakistan wanted to secure its own territory from insurgency and local militias while having an eye on India. Recent elections in the United States and economic aggravation internally, compelling it to finish the war in Afghanistan.

It is for sure that Pakistan can turn many things if it is given the needed support from the United States and financial institutions and other friendly states, however, it needs to do a lot at the domestic level to reorder the political system and rearrange the political priorities. The year

Akbar Nasir Khan, "The US Policy of Target Killing by Drones In Pakistan." *IPRI Journal 11*, No. 1, winter (2011): 23.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>159</sup> Aftab Hussain, "Strained US-Pakistan ties Threaten Region." *Islamabad Policy Research Institute* (IPRI), January 4 (2013): 24.

2009, considered for the missed opportunities for both the United States and Pakistan because many good intentions were undermined by subsequent actions. The famous Kerry-Lugar bill for military aid was read in Pakistan as a threat having conditions as previously sanctions imposed on Pakistan. The continuous delays in the coalition support funds became the source of unhappiness on both the sides. The flawed coalition support fund remained an impediment in the way to building a strong relationship between the two allies. There are many other divergences of interests that can weaken this relationship of Islamabad and Washington at large.

### Pakistan and Taliban

These attacks unleashed far-reaching implications on the world in general and Pakistan in particular. Immediate result was overthrown of Taliban government which was blamed to prove sanctuaries to the terrorists. The United States pursued the doctrine of pre-emption to attack the Iraq and Afghanistan. These developments had not only deep impacts on the global political scenario. Political, economic, military and ideological repercussions were imposed on the transforming world order.

Pakistan has long standing close ties with the Taliban in Afghanistan. During the Soviet invasion these Taliban factions proved lethal to eradicate and disintegrate the Soviets. However, in the post 9/11 phase these were declared terrorists by the United States without any delay or prior ultimatum. After all, Islamabad has to take a policy shift from pro-Taliban to anti-Taliban but it was a big decision on the part of Islamabad's policy makers. Washington has of the view that Afghani Taliban having close ties with Pakistani Taliban's and Pukhtoons because they have strong social and cultural bonds with the Pakhtoons of Pakistan's northwestern areas. Having said this, Islamabad has strong bond with the Afghani Taliban's but no affiliation with Pakistani Taliban because their distinct ideologies and objectives. Moreover, these Taliban are sponsored and groomed by the intelligence services of Pakistan far two to three decades. America has of the view that main cause of deterioration of law and order situation are Taliban.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>160</sup> Dan Barak, Einav Yogev and Yorem Schewitzer, "A Trouble Geo-Strategic Marriage: US Pakistan Relations."
Military and Strategic Affairs, Vol. 3, No. 2, September (2011): 37.

They have time and again asked the Pakistan to fight with them in North Waziristan while Pakistan is reluctant to do accordingly. 161

Apart from this, Pakistan has focused on this fact that peace would not be able to ensure in the post US Afghan withdrawal without the Taliban assistance. Washington has also realized the reality that it is significantly necessary to give Taliban leverage to bring stability in Afghanistan. Peace in the region can be brought if the Taliban rule is accepted where they are in majority and given them the political identity. Only this is the way when peaceful exit of the western forces is ensured from Afghanistan if power is delivered to the stakeholders on equal footing. Once again, Washington has realized the fact that Islamabad can play significant role in this regard to bring the Taliban on table for the future plan of action in Afghanistan and for the restoration of peace and security in the region. On other hand, Islamabad raises certain questions on the US support to New Delhi and to provoke their role in the strategic region. Pakistan can play a decisive role in the effective and less costly withdrawal of the United States from Afghanistan with the collaboration of Taliban regime if they are enough confident on the sincerity of the Washington. This reality has been now realizes by the patron as well for regional peace and security.

## Security Challenges to Pakistan and United States in Post 9/11 Phase

In the post 9/11 era, Pakistan and the United States are facing plenty of challenges in terms of safety and security because of having many threats from local militias due to their strategic alliance in the war on terror and convergence of policies. One of the many grave issues is the killing of innocent people during the fight against terrorism whose near ones in reaction inflict a large scale loss to the security forces in Pakistan while Taliban in Afghanistan are using guerrilla tactics against the occupied foreign forces and inflict these forces with intervals whenever gets the opportunity. It is quite obvious that Pakistan is there in the war against terror as a key ally for her own reasons but the fundamental elements in Pakistan see this cooperation as a threat and perceive Pakistani security forces helping the aggressor superpower state in her nefarious designs which create hatred for these agencies.

Marvin G. wainbaum, "Pakistan and Afghanistan: the Stategic Relationship." *Asian Survey*, University of California Press, Vol. 31, No. 6, June (1991): 503. Available on: <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/2645079">http://www.jstor.org/stable/2645079</a>. Accessed on: 12/11/2012.

Afghanistan Taliban continuously attack the sensitive targets of the United States and NATO forces causing severe harm in the heart of the Kabul indicates the inefficiency of the Afghan security forces and also tells how the Taliban are going to act during the withdrawal of the Afghanistan and in the post reconciliation phase if the peace efforts could not materialized. The US plans to redeploy forces with the combinations of covert operations and drone attacks to keep the Taliban under pressure. Undoubtedly, Pakistan can be a critical factor for the success and failure. Pakistan can play a decisive role in the reconciliation process. Because no strategy can work out or impact without the Pakistan support as the US desires. If the forces leave the Afghanistan in this situation then Pakistan has to control the situation within its northern areas and in Afghanistan in two interconnected fronts.

The main impediment in the strategy of Pakistan may be joint alliance of Afghanistan-US-India to weaken Pakistan so that it may not pursue any significant strategy in Afghanistan. The United States strategy that involves the actions against the targets in Pakistan would never lead this client and patron relationship towards positive direction. In this way, image of distrust would be created about Pakistan. If the security concerns of the Pakistan would not taken under consideration then it may enhance vulnerabilities of future of the combat against terrorism that would be definitely futile.

Issues of terrorism and nuclear proliferation reached to the top after occurrence of these events. That is the reason that world community is paying a great attention to these issues for which Pakistan come under the direct limelight. Pakistan cannot remain unaffected for these momentous changes in the global political and regional level after 9/11. India has emerged as a major power in the initial stage of this century. Pakistan has to see carefully the changes that are taking place at global and regional level to bring about necessary adjustments in internal, external, security and economic policies. Failure of which can bring severe implications for Pakistan. <sup>163</sup>

Moreover, both the client and patron states as strategic allies have certain security perspectives on their respective fronts while expecting a certain level of cooperation from each other.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>162</sup> Graeme P. Herd, ed. Great Powers and Strategic Stability in 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Competing Vision of World Order. New York: Routledge, 2010: 237.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>163</sup> Jetly Rajshree, ed. Pakistan in the Regional and Global Politics. London: Rutledge Taylor and Francis group, 2009; 53.

Theoretically, Washington ensures the security of the Islamabad in return of its cooperation in the political and military objectives of the pentagon. Ironically, this is a most problematic dimension of the cliental partnership because at present security dynamics has become most relevant and prevailing perspectives for the states in international anarchical system. Security concerns are quite visible in the states foreign policies whether it is America or any other underdeveloped state but intensity level on the basis of priorities can be different in this realm.

However, in case of Pakistan and the United States there is altogether different state of affairs where patron is making client's security and stability vulnerable with the continuous drone attacks which some times, lead Pakistan to be reluctant and non-cooperative occasionally. It seems that cliental relationship between Pakistan and the US is going through the transition with the policy divergence actions of the US. Usual non-compliance and reluctance of the Islamabad transforming this strategic partnership to the new level of cliental politics that is called estranged clientage that seems most visible after the attacks of NATO forces on the bordering Pakistani areas, Salala attacks and continuous drone attacks where sovereignty has been continuously violated by Washington. The nature of relations between both the strategic allies has reached to somewhat, at the 'estranged clientage' where client break the ties and become reluctant when patron crosses the threshold by ignoring the security and sovereignty of the weaker dependent state.

Continuous non-compliance can cross the threshold of hearting stalemate by resulting in the discontinuation of strategic partnership and dire effects with the creation of suspicion and distrust on the part of both the states in future course of action. This output would be detrimental not only for the interests of the Islamabad but also for the greater designs of the Pentagon in the long run. Such emerging scenario would be dangerous for the hegemonic designs of the patron. In this way it will not be wrong to say that breakup would not only disturb the regional equation but is capable of turning the prevailing political system on the regional and global level. <sup>164</sup>

Cliental relation is much in favor of America for the success of its war on terror and other global designs to maintain its hegemony in the world over. This is only possible if the interests of Islamabad are protected in terms of security, development of military capabilities on bilateral

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>164</sup> Fredric Grare, "Re-thinking Western Strategies Towards Pakistan: An Agenda for the United States and Europe." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, September (2007): 27.

level. Another major irritant that can be detrimental for this strategic partnership is increased cooperation with New Delhi in civil-nuclear and technological level that can be lethal for the client's minimum credible deterrence. Even if it is not avoided in the agenda of Washington then both the enemy states should be dealt on equal footing to maintain the equality and peace in the region ultimately.

Cliental relationship would maintain its credible viability if both the partners preserve mutual interests and it would definitely consolidate the cliental relationship and seems inevitable for the Pentagon security and political solidarity in the broader picture. It clearly defines the Islamabad's strength due to its geo-strategic location in the most volatile region and being present at the cross roads of the future emerging powers that are competitors of Washington. That's why Islamabad having a greater significance in the eyes of America because it most relevant partner that can play broader role for the greater designs of Washington in the coming decades of 21<sup>st</sup> century. There is no denying the fact that in the last one decade since 9/11 the policy of Pakistan evolved based on its security. This clarifies the nature of Pakistan as security states that behave in a certain way while keeping in mind its security and survival first. The war on terror depicts its policies based on its security that's why never ignored United States. In the cliental relations of both the states since 9/11, security factor has been prevailing to the strategic partnership on the part of both the states indiscriminately.

#### CHAPTER FIVE

This chapter has been divided into five sections which focus mainly on the politico-economic ties of Pakistan and US as Interdependent states in their strategic partnership in this phase. This chapter mainly argues about political and economic dynamics of the cliental relations that depicts that increased dependence of the client make it a subservient to the patron in its actions and policies. Islamabad remains significant until it is used by the Washington, however, completion of the task make it useless. This case study clearly defines the nature of such kind of relationship between the two strategic partners in the post 9/11 era.

#### Pakistan-US Political and Economic Ties 2001-2010

With the end of cold war and especially after the tragic events of 9/11, the global environment underwent radical transformation. Not only a new world order emerged but its impacts on various regions posed fresh challenges and opportunities. Post cold war new world order was in process of evolution and yet to reach the maturity, another new world order in the wake of 9/11 tragedy is marked by the confusion, uncertainty and contradictory tendencies.

Pakistan and United States as a strategic partners have an episodic and a unique relationship of suspicion and trust-deficit with one other. However, on every crucial and critical strategic issue patron asks for clients support for the success and up gradation of its status. A role which a client plays in the competition of patron is very much political and diplomatic in nature. A weaker state if supports the agenda of the patron in the United Nations or any other platform of the world then it would be a political support for the patron in the international political system. Same is the case with Islamabad because it endorses almost all the policies and actions of the superpower. Pakistan-US Partnership relations are not easy on either of the side as Pakistan perceives that US can play decisive role to solve Indian-centric issues and all other threats faced by India including Kashmir. Pakistan has been involved in grave crises due to great powers and took a great risk by joining war on terror as a frontline state despite the US betrayal in the past. History of relations between Islamabad and Washington has been both cooperation and full of conflicts.

Many strategic interests in the region bring both the states closer, however; a different out look of foreign policy on many international issues leads them poles apart. But relations of both the countries survive despite many hurdles and issues. Geo-strategic location of Pakistan being

situated on the cross-roads of south, central and west Asia has made it significant in the eyes of the big powers and the super power especially. Strategic location of the country made it a golden sparrow in the eyes of the big powers to meet their vested strategic interests in this volatile region. Pakistan- US strategic partnership has been self-serving and need based rather than mutual cooperation. <sup>165</sup>

All the governments in Pakistan whether civilian or military always wanted to have constructive relations with the US and the Musharraf government was no different from this cooperative thinking to establish bilateral and cordial relations with the United States. In the post 9/11 phase due to its close proximities and recognition of the Taliban government brought severe implications for Pakistan as it came under the spotlight for the war on terror. Undoubtedly, Pakistan has played a pivotal role in the war on terror but yet many policy makers in Washington are suspicious about the role of Pakistan whether in the war on terror it is part of problem or the solution. Main points of concerns for the westerns are Pakistan's connections with terrorism, extremism, resurgence of Taliban, cross-boarder infiltration and future of democracy.

Previously, Pakistan and the US relations have experienced either a period of cooperation or period of thaw in their strategic relations largely because of the convergence or divergence of the American global strategies, policy priorities and Pakistan regional concerns. After the terrorist attacks on Pentagon a period of cooperation started again with the realignment of client state Pakistan by mentioning it a front line ally. Though, patron the US commends the role of Pakistan at the international level but criticism is also raised time and again for not doing sufficient. In the face of American pressure to suspend the support of the Taliban Pakistan being politically burdened and having economic and debt constraints, a crippling economy, hostile state India in neighborhood and public opinion left with no other way out but to join the US and take a U-turn on Taliban policy.

Pakistan-US relations may be described in certain dimensions by analyzing the US approach towards Pakistan in the post 9/11 era. There have been US development assistance to it previously they provided military aid but now they changed the policy by allocating to the human development. The US engagement with the Pakistan military has been one of distinct

Daniel Markey, "A False Choice in Pakistan." Foreign Affairs (Council on Foreign Affairs), Vol. 86, No. 4, August (2007): 87. Available on: <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032417">http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032417</a>. Accessed on: 11/1/2013.

factor of the American policy. The support of Pakistan military has been continued. Previously, target of the America was Lashkar-e-Tayba and now is the Haqqani network. Another dimension of this client patron relationship was support for the democracy in Pakistan. <sup>166</sup>

Though, this have been declared policy of the United States but it is yet to be seen that what would be US reaction when the political leadership would oppose the American policies to Pakistan. At that time, how America would respond and would bring the real outcome of this approach. Humanitarian assistance to Pakistan has been one of another main factor of the United States approach to the Pakistan. In this context, the United States gave substantial aid to Pakistan during the earthquake of 2006 and the floods of 2010. The United States drone attacks policy has been disastrous and most controversial one. Though, America gives her own justification for these attacks but these attacks are very unpopular in Pakistan. However, these attacks are leading to the breeding of more terrorist in the region. The US engagement with Pakistan military seems vague one because Laskar-e-Tayaba is no where while the Haqqani network is operative only in Afghanistan. The western society in general and the US in particular has become more introvert and takes pride on the exceptionalism in the post 9/11 era. The western society has become close society in the name of security in this phase.

## Role of Economy in Cliental Relations

Economic factor is significant in the cliental relationship because economic dependence makes it a stronger relationship. Dependence theory is just like the client and patron relationship. Client's complete dependence on the patron state formulates this relationship on the strong grounds because being dependent state client sometimes, compromise the vital interests like sovereignty and autonomy. Taking into consideration the economic support in terms of aid and debts Pakistan has been completely dependent on the United States that's why Pakistan has to be compliant on the demands of the United States.

Pakistan and the United States are no different from this as Pakistan supports their agenda of promoting democracy and peace it plays the role of client state. On the other hand, economic dependence makes a weak state a client of the strong patron. Dependence on the other state for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>166</sup> Stephen P. Cohen, The Future of Pakistan (Washington D.C.: The Brooking Institution, 2001), 54.

Dan Barak, Elinav Yokiv, "A Trouble Geostrategic Marriage: US-Pakistan Relations." Military and Strategic Affairs, Vol. 3, No.2, November (2011): 39.

economic and political needs establish a very strong relationship of client and patron in which patron always uses the client for its benefits. A weak state plays a key role for the success of patron's competition in the world. This assumption is very much visible during the cold war when Pakistan supported the United States by all means to counter the Soviet Union and now to eradicate the terrorism in the war on terror. This relationship of economic dependence is crystal clear between Pakistan and the United States. However, the Washington used Pakistan not only during the cold war to counter the Soviet Union but also now in the war on terror. Moreover, what is more exceptional this time is that the sovereignty of client is being compromised being a weaker state for the larger strategic interests of the United States. 168

Economic factor is a major decisive factor in this unique case scenario of Pakistan and the United States in which client is not only dependent on aid but the Washington is also biggest export market economy for the Pakistan. This factor not only enlarges the economic ties but also strengthened the economic dependence of the Islamabad on the US. It is due to the economic factor that relationship between Pakistan and the US as a client and patron maintained and remained intact since the beginning of this strategic alliance. Pakistan for its flawed and deteriorating economy was compelled to join the war on terror because it is a reality that without the help of the West and the United States it is almost impossible for Pakistan to run the affairs of the state due to economic instability. Islamabad always show the attitude of compliance for the economic gains and there is no difference in case of Pakistan when it supports the US in the war on terror as an ally for the economic and security oriented gains. It clearly shows that economy is a vital factor in the cliental relationship. 169

The cliental political theory is just like the theory of dependence in which client state for its economic reliance and security needs become compliant to the patron policies and demands. Despite all the divergences of policies and ideologies, patron is supported by the client in the pursuance of policy making and makes strategic alliance on the critical issues. Client states always remain submissive to the patron and compliant to the policies and demands of the patron. Islamabad appeared as a staunch frontline ally in the war against terror to support the patron for the economic dependence. The patron state promised to serve and protect the political, economic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>168</sup> S. Akbar Zaidi, "A Failed State Or Failure of Pakistan's Elite." *Economic and Political Weekely*, Vol. 43, No. 28, July (2008): 10. Available on: <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/2027708">http://www.jstor.org/stable/2027708</a>. Accessed on: 29/11/2012.
<sup>169</sup> Ibid. 11-14.

and security concerns of the Client in return for the cooperation of client on every critical issue that is persuaded by the patron in the global arena. Client provides support to promote the global interests of the patron state in terms of political and ideological contexts despite the presence of all the disparities that exists between the client and patron. Cliental theory is applicable on the bilateral level on mutual benefits just like the theory of dependence in which patron gets much benefit as compare to the client state.

## **Economic Dependence Strengthens Client-Patron Relationship**

Economic dependence leads to the strong cliental relationship because it consolidates the nature of cliental relationship. Pakistan and the United States are client and the patron since the beginning of their relationship without any doubt. However, Pakistan has been dependent on the United States for her economic and military needs that was the only reason that Pakistan tilted towards the western block by ignoring the Soviets offers. Pakistan was in search of the alliance for the security and protection of the state from the emerging threats. There is no denying the fact that economic dependence strengthens the client-patron relationship because client state is compelled to coordinate with the patron0. The client state shows compliance to the patron for the economic gains, if the economic support is suspended then the services and compliant behavior may be stopped by the client by showing reluctance on a policy event. Sometimes, when the sovereignty and autonomy of the client is threatened then it may show non-compliance behavior to the patron and becomes non-cooperative. This case study Pakistan is no different from this situation which is supporting all the policies of the patron for the purpose of certain rewards or one can say due to its excessive dependence it is compelled to cooperate with the patron without discrimination.

It is quite obvious that as the clients excessive dependence weakens the cliental relationship by increasing over-reliance on the patron with the loss of client sovereignty while the mutual dependence enhances the strength of this client-patron relation who as a result cooperate each other on bilateral level to protect the bilateral strategic interests. Just to pursue the interests of the patron or suppression of the interests of the other state leads this relationship to the break up and make it a temporary and short term strategic cooperation. Protection of economic, security and political interests of the client state is soul of this cliental political relationship which is applied on the affairs of interstate affairs in the world. Economic dimension seems stronger as compare

to other aspects of the cliental relations because it compels the client to be compliant and subservient to the partner while pursuing its policies towards patron. More the economic dependence more the cliental relationship would be strong and vice versa.

# Pakistan's Economic Lethargy and Re-Subordination in 21st Century

Today, the economy is in shambles and dependency on the United States has magnified, the society is deeply fragmented and polarized while the rulers are busy in their own personal interest rather national interests. Deteriorating economic condition and social development policies have led the country to miserable condition by strengthening the poverty. By the same token, Pakistan's political and military leaders have followed the path of client which resulted in the greater dependency and re-subordination in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. <sup>170</sup>There ruling elite were never interested in state-building, nation building and guiding the country's socio-economic development trajectory. Instead, they became addicted to the idea of foreign assistance. <sup>171</sup> In addition to the United States aid, Pakistan became the recipient of long term, interest bearing loans from international development associations like IMF. As the dependency of Pakistan increased on these loans then like all third world countries, it also stopped trying to broaden its exports and even to develop an internal market. Resultantly, imports expanded manifolds with this increased loans dependence and made the economic condition of Pakistan vulnerable.

Lethargy on the part of military rulers in Pakistan around the issue of economic liberalization did not translate into a change in Pakistan's client status; it does not mean that state would not facilitate the external domination of the United States and western transnational corporations. The United States is more concerned with the larger objective of ensuring an effective role of Pakistan as previously in afghan war against the Soviets and now in the war on terrorism. The capitalists class in Pakistan is more of involved in backdoor dealing and dependent on the military and civil bureaucracy as compare to India where capitalist class maintain its dominating status in the society. Pakistan is a proto-capitalist state having a very weak economy and politically instable while the rulers being dependent on the foreign aid having no interest in taking the advantage of the available talent and resources in Pakistan to grow the economy and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>170</sup> Ishtiaq Ahmed, "Pakistan and Patrons: The United States, China and Saudi Arabia." *Institute of South Asian Studies*, ISAS Working Group, No. 135, October (2011): 7.

give the direction to economic and social development. Within this economic, political and social environment, the imperial is giving few billion dollars in assistance and in return receive disproportionate military benefit and advantage. In economic terms this a great commercial deal for the United States.

The United States has acquired the military bases on Pakistani soil, its intelligence agents are roaming in the country to kill the innocent people at their will and violate the state sovereignty when they conduct aerial drone attacks or while capturing Osama Bin Laden. It can take individuals into physical custody to whom it wanted to arrest by giving least consideration to law and attack the Pakistan's military and security forces when and where it wished with the assurance that no American life would loss. So this character of Pakistan encompasses the state that is extremely dependent on the imperial power and is very weak vis-à-vis external political and economic pressure. The political elite have become more reliant on the United States and other financial institutions while greatly compromising Pakistan's sovereignty.<sup>172</sup>

Pakistan has sunk deeper into the dependency and because clientalism is accompanying offshoot of dependency, Pakistan's subordination to imperial dictates has been re-intensified. In other words, internal condition has coincided with the externally re-structured imposition of imperialist domination to bring about the re-subordination of Pakistani state and society since 11 September 200, more extremely. In Pakistan it is believed that by capturing the political power play a crucial role in accessing the economic opportunities. Washington believes that once Islamabad became economically dependant then it will be subordinate to the patron and definitely would comply with all the patron policies. However, in case of economic independence or diverted reliance on other major powers may decrease its compliant attitude to reluctance and non-compliance. This kind of changed reliance would also change the nature of relationship between the strategic partners. The capitalist has always tilted to imperial capitalist patron by making the state subordinate to the United States to get the economic benefits and mortgaged the state sovereignty for its increased economic dependence purely for their own individual interests. 173

<sup>1/2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>173</sup> Tariq Amin Khan, Genealogy of the Post-Colonial State in India and Pakistan (Islamabad: Vanguard Publisher, 2012), 198-99.

## Double Standards in American Foreign Policy

There is no denying the fact that the US distrusted Pakistan and its intelligence agencies for their double-standard policy towards Taliban and for its role in the war on terror. But it was a strategic compulsion for them to make the Pakistan an ally as it was almost impossible to win the war on terror without the partnership of Pakistan. Rivalry between India and Pakistan continued, the US proved naive that Indo-Pak rivalry would deescalate and both the states would be combined on the front of war on terror. Kashmir dispute remained the key issue of rivalry between India and Pakistan. Pakistan never wanted Indian influence in the Kabul but the ethnic issues and US-Indian ties has brought the India in the arena by arousing the rivalry between India and Pakistan. Moreover, intelligence sharing can be proved a key in operationalization of war in the pursuit of Al-Qaeda members. Pakistan nuclear weapons security and internal stability has been constant point of concerns for the United States. It is also a ground reality on the part of US that they never become satisfied with the role of Pakistan in the war on terror. <sup>174</sup>

After 9/11 security dynamics of the region changed due to Pakistan alliance in the war on terror with the US and her strained relations with India. India got the opportunity to change the mind of US and west by pleading the case of Kashmir as they are combating with terrorism. The US asked Pakistan to hunt Al-Qaeda and Taliban in the tribal region otherwise they would march into the territory of Pakistan. Pakistan started operations against the terrorist outfits and hunt them down by turning the security from operational to a full scale war. However, double standards policy on the part of Washington has broader repercussions in the long term strategy. Thought America has given Islamabad a status of most allied ally in the war on terror but its growing tilt towards India has been problematic for the long term strategic partnership of Islamabad and Washington. On one hand, master has been assuring the partner for its sincerity and cooperation on all the issues concern while on the other hand, it has established strong ties with New Delhi which depicts its double standard policy because it can be lethal for strategic partnership and world peace ultimately.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>174</sup>Ahmed Rashid, Decent into Chaos, the World's most Unstable Region and Threat to Global Security (London: Penguin Books, 2008), 43.

## Political Cooperation: Two Way Traffic

In cliental relationship political support is extended on bilateral level on the basis of mutual understanding and cooperation. The client supports the political agendas of the patron on the world political forums and seconds their thoughts on policy matters in the international arena. The patron also extends cooperation for the client on their policy priorities objectives. Pakistan and the United States extend diplomatic support mutually in their respective policy objectives in the post 9/11 scenario.

However, events of September 11, 2001 changed the United States strategic policy dynamics and Pakistan once again became key strategic ally in the war against terrorism. The US never considered Pakistan in negligible quantity in any of geographical realm. It always shares limited but significant policy concerns with the US at regional and global level. Pakistan was in isolation and doldrums when it decided to join the war on terror and came into the mainstream of international politics. Pakistan- US alliance in the past and present is a unique case of partnership full of conflicts and ends in disappointments. It is true in its essence, when there is a partnership between two states then the stronger would define the partnership strategy. So it's clear that stronger ally strategies, policies and interests will prevail even to that extent that vital interests of weaker state might be sacrificed for this.

World history has witnessed that stronger states take the benefit in terms of vested interests and policies and weaker have to suffer so is the case with Pakistan- US strategic partnership relations where with all exceptions cliental relation is on the rise. It is correctly warned by the Machiavelli to the weaker prince to make alliance with the stronger prince or the state. Pakistan is not only supporting the policy goals of the patron but also practically taking part in it for the success of her interests under the umbrella of world peace. The US-led war on terror coordinated by Pakistan with all means as a most allied ally that seems impossible to win without the cooperation of the client state because of their strategic location in the region. However, Pakistan being a client state is also expecting from the patron to support them on the issue of Kashmir.

<sup>176</sup>A. Z. Hilali, US Pakistan Relationship (United States: Aghast Publishing Company, 2005), 18.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>175</sup> Shahnaz Akhtar, "Dynamics of US-Pakistan Relations in the Post 9/11 Period: Hurdles and Future Prospectus." International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 2, No. 11, June (2012): 207-11.

It is believed by the Pakistan that the United States can play a decisive role in the solution of Kashmir and ensuring peace between Pakistan and India. In their view only the United States has of the credibility to pressurise India to come on the table for the negotiations to solve the issue of Kashmir. Threat of nuclear proliferation is taken as a serious point of concern for west in general and the United States in particular as the issue of terrorism. It is also true that western nations and America are guilty of using double standards in dealing with the threat of nuclear proliferation as it is shown by the differences in their policies towards Israel and India, on one hand, Pakistan and Iran, on the other hand.

The fact that present international order is power-driven cannot be over-emphasized. The agenda of international community and the rules of international attitudes so far primarily been determined by the west and America, reflecting its political, military, economic and cultural power and domination of the globe. In other words, power of the United States and the western powers not only enable them to decide them that which game is to be played but also the rules of the game. The situation is now changing as new emerging power impacted at large on the consideration of international security, economic and political issues.<sup>177</sup>

If the client state extends the full scale support to the superior partner then the patron may ignore their non-cooperation on the less severe issues. The United States has broader designs in the region that's why Pakistan's role for its geo-strategic importance is very crucial for the United States in the long run. Ironically, this strategic partnership does not seem long term for certain reasons and might ended soon because the political interests of the client state are not given consideration by the patron state. Another aspect of this is that the United States has not played any role nor practically intervened into the matter of Kashmir issue but has developed strong ties with the India and gave it the status of big regional power. Moreover, the United States has developed strong ties with India by making a nuclear deal by completely ignoring the concerns of its old client. This picture clearly shows that this partnership would not go ahead long way. 178

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>177</sup>Muhammad Saleem, Mussarart Jabeen, Naheed S. Goraya, ed. *Post 9/11 Globe*. Lahore: Center for South Asian Studies, 2010: 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>178</sup> Ashley j. Tellis and Michael Wills, "confronting Terrorism in the Pursuit of Power." *Strategic Asia*, the National Bureau of Asian Research (2004-2005): 228.

### Pakistan's Economic and Political Interests

In the post 9/11 phase, with the change of global politics Pakistan became a point of great concern for the big powers for fulfillment of their interests in the region. Before the terrorist attacks the relations between Pakistan and the Washington were towards downward spiral. With the advent of this event Pakistan came into the limelight of the big powers especially the old patron the United States because it played a pivotal role during the cold war against the Soviet Union by fighting a proxy war for the patron. With all its political compulsions, Pakistan came in between the global powers the United States and China two major competitors in economic realm both always wanted Pakistan on their side to get benefit out of the Pakistan role and strategic importance in the region in the broader political goal.

Though, relations of Islamabad and Washington were facing downfall but 9/11 events enhanced the significance of strategic partnership between client and patron. Pakistan strategically exists on a location where there are two largest competitors in the realm of economy the United States and China. Reasoning which Musharraf gave to accept the demands of the US was to save the Nuclear programme and keep alive the Kashmir issue along with economic assistance. Denial might invite the nuclear war and the US had thrown diplomatic support behind India on Kashmir issue by declaring Pakistan a terrorist state. Washington has not been happy with Pakistan-military assistance and intelligence sharing. Even more troubling from the US point of view is that Pakistan has not done enough to curb the anti-American Pakistani sentiments and threats of jihad and terrorism against the United States.

The rise of Islamist forces in Pakistan and retreat of government on many domestic issues and demands have worried Pakistan. The US officials suspect that there are times when Pakistan allows a certain amount of radicalism to flourish to negate the US pressure on its leaders. Pakistan is regarded as a gate way to Muslim world for the Unites States. Although, it has become tough for Pakistan to convince the US about this idea but it is still persisted in doing so. After 9/11 Pakistan has continuously asserted of being a moderate Islamic state and society. Many policies followed by Pakistan to prove the point. Friendly relations with the US are very essential for the Pakistan's security due to its estranged relations with the neighbors. However, many factors occurring on this regional arena by creating uncertainty to mutual strategic

partnership. Pakistan relations with the US have been positive for the regional stability. It's true that Pakistan is facing pressure from both the fronts. 179

On one side, from the US while on the other part from China. Both of these actors in the region recognize the importance of strategic location of Pakistan in the region. These bilateral relations of Pakistan with the US and China somewhat ensure the regional stability vis-à-vis Pakistan security and beneficial to contain the India in effective way by keeping the Kashmir issue alive. Events in 2001 not only shocked the United States but also the rest of the world as a whole. In global politics of the big powers Pakistan has become a key actor to ensure their strategic interests in the triangle of Washington, Beijing and Moscow.

However, despite all these global and regional realities Pakistan as a client state has a unique relationship with the United States due to its long term economic dependence and political assistance. The Washington is the largest importer of the client's commodities. So, Pakistan is always in need of the US for the fulfillment of its economic gains and market access. 181

Another aspect is the economic dependence on the Washington for their aids and debts to Pakistan ever since the inception of Pakistan. Pakistan tilted to the western block by ignoring the offer of the Soviet Union for multiple factors. Furthermore, Pakistan always wanted to have Washington role in the solution of Kashmir issue vis-à-vis India so that it could be solved according to the United Nations resolutions. But it is ironic on the part of patron state; it never extended help to that sincere level for the peaceful solution of Kashmir according to the whims and wishes of the people to meet their long standing legal demand. Since, Islamabad provided all-out assistance to Washington once during the Soviet invasion and now in the United States led war on terror by providing military assistance to eradicate the terrorist factions from the region. Though, Islamabad had certain compulsions in terms of economy, political and security

<sup>180</sup> Amer Rizwan, "South Asia Security Complex and Pakistan-United States Relations Post 9/11." *IPRI Journal10*, No. 2, Summer (2010): 50.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>179</sup> Ashley J. Tellis, "Pakistan and the War on Terror: Conflicted Goals, Compromised Performance." *Carnegie Endowment for International Studies*, Washington (2008): 7.

Moeed Yousuf, "Rational Institutional Designs, Perverse Incentives, and the US-Pakistan Partnership in the Post 9/11." *Defense Against Terrorism Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, Spring (2009): 17.

level which compelled it to join this fight against terrorism to avoid any further misadventures and fallouts. 182

A U-turn policy on the Taliban altogether changed the outlook of the Islamabad's foreign policy but once again security of the state remained dominant factor to keep it safe and many factors like economic and political contributed a lot to shape this policy outlook of Pakistan. Islamabad's economic reliance heavily been dependent on west from very initial stage and it expected political favor at large scale from Washington for the solution of all strategic and political issues with India. Ironically, both of these aims seems non-practical because the United States always used double-standards policy on the basis of national interests and came closer to the client in the time of great concern.

Moreover, Washington never wanted to spoil her relations with New Delhi by keeping in mind the long term strategic interests relevant to this volatile region and to face all those threats that could be potential threats to its ongoing hegemony and superpower status in world in which India can be much beneficial to meet all these challenges in the regional context because all the threat perceptions that are expected to challenge the Washington hegemonic policies are expected to emerge from this region. Islamabad is almost as a whole is dependent in terms of economic needs and support on the west in general and the United States in particular. Theoretically, there is no denying the fact that a client state extends all possible help to the patron to meet its policy goals to get economic advantage and prestigious status in the eyes of the world in the global arena, in return. Even if the client state refuses to support the patron political, strategic and security policies to gain the strategic interests then it is opposed and pressurized on diplomatic level and threatened of dire consequences in case of the denial of cooperation at the political and strategic level.<sup>183</sup>

Political and economic spheres are two dimensions which have been directing factors to formulate the foreign policy of Pakistan to a certain direction. Though, results have not been to that extent for which Islamabad extended its full support but it has been successful in securing the state from the immediate threat to its very survival and integrity along with threat from New

Ayesha Syiddiqa Agha, "Pakistan Security Percpetions," in Security and Nuclear Stabilization in South Asia, ed. Imtiaz Alam (Lahore: Free Media Foundation, 2006), 204.
183 Ibid.

Delhi from the western boarders. However, despite all the irregularities, the strategic partnership between Pakistan and the United States still survives as a client and patron states after the long period of misunderstandings and many upheavals.<sup>184</sup>

## The United States Global Political Designs in the Eve of 9/11

The post 9/11 scenario is changing and has transformed with definite transformation. The United States remains economically, politically and militarily a powerful nation in the world while its Uni-polar status has already passed. It is now facing growing challenges from the rising powers from the different parts of the globe, the most important being China. The international trend now is changing from Uni-polar world to Multi-polar world in which the US, China, Japan, Russia, India and Brazil would play dominant role in international affairs in near future. However, despite all these realities one dominating factor is that Washington wanted to maintain its hegemony vis-à-vis these regional powers in the strategic region South Asia.

Most importantly, after the terrorist attacks the fight against terrorism is also providing an opportunity to the United States to stay in the this strategic region to be effective and keep check on all the key emerging powers in the wake of terrorist attacks and to achieve their strategic interests in the most relevant region for Washington in the world. Obviously, rise of China and India would change the strategic scene in Asia. The next couple of decades would see the adjustment of the emerging powers interests in the world order. However, the only question remains unaddressed that whether these changes come about peacefully or otherwise. It is also yet to be seen that whether Pakistan would progress with the same developing pace and play her due role in the international affairs. <sup>185</sup>

The Bush administration concept of war on terror focused narrowly on developing an operational response to terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda. It is ironic on the US part that no efforts have been made to assess the motivations and mindset of the terrorists and to modify the US foreign and defense policies on the basis of that valid assessment. Contrary to this, terrorist's motivation is subjected to the US presence in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf and the unconditional support of the Washington given to the Israel on the issue of Palestine has been the topic of great

185 ibid

<sup>184</sup> Shahid M. Amin, Pakistan's foreign policy (UK: Oxford University Publisher, 2010), 319.

concern and a solid reason for motivation against the US in the broader terms. After many years of 9/11 attacks, it has become intellectually respectable to discuss the flaws of the war on terror and the Washington self-defeating policies based on this concept which has strengthened the local forces in many countries and made them sympathetic to Al-Qaeda and terrorist groups.

The United States wanted to maintain the sole superpower status and have broader global designs for this purpose. The south Asian region is very much significant in this regard because the United States has long term interests in the region. It has been perceived that the United States made lame excuse to intervene in this region of conflict. Moreover, the United States has global designs to maintain their superpower status in this region is very significant. The United States has many reasons to stay in the region due to certain threats perceived by it from the emerging states in this volatile region of the world.

For the fulfillment of patron objectives Pakistan can be of great significance to achieve these goals and can be supportive to acquire these interests because of its geo-strategic location. Though, in the post 9/11, the United States has an objective to crush the terrorism and extremist activities along with its geo-strategic and political goals to maintain its status quo as a sole super power. Pakistan can be decisive for the attainment of the greater interests of the Washington. Many emerging and Muslim states challenge the writ of the United States because they perceive it as a power show of the United States however, these states are taken and perceived as anti-American and tried to contain these states with full scale below. 186

So for as the concern of the United States policy after 9/11 is, Bush administration mainly focused on operational option rather than assessing the motivation of mindset of terrorists and to modify the US defense and foreign policies basis on that assessment. Contrary to this, terrorist were motivated in opposition of US military presence in the Persian Gulf. These are the US self-defeating policies that terrorists won sympathies of many Muslim countries in different part of the world. The US has indeed magnified the challenge of terrorism. The United States overburdened Pakistan by repeated threats that it should be in all realms otherwise; get ready for the dire consequences.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>186</sup> Noor Ul Haq, "Unipolarism and US-Pakistan Relations." *Institute of Policy Research Islamabad* (IPRI), Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter (2006):103.

US supported Musharraf regime economically, militarily and diplomatically and in return took full scale cooperation in terms of all means in the war on terror. At the domestic political level Pakistan is facing dire ethic issues. For government, it is much important to deal with ethnic strife as compare to satisfying of the US about al-Qaeda and Taliban. In the post cold war phase the US foreign policy changed by tilting towards India. Significance of Pakistan decreased in the eyes of the US. Now they were more concerned with the strategic problems like nuclear weapon and Islamic extremism. However, events of 2001 changed the view of the US once gain Pakistan became key strategic ally for them. Pakistan again becomes a frontline ally in the war on terror in Afghanistan. The US was more concerned with Terrorism and Islamic fundamentalists along with the Pakistan nuclear weapons.

## Afghan Episode

War on terror waged on the suspected terrorists in the country of strategic depth with the help of Pakistan against Al-Qaeda and Taliban, and once proved to be a graveyard for the Soviet Union two decades ago. In the post 9/11 situation because the terrorists had links with Afghanistan so it came under the limelight of the world. Pakistan was pursuing the pro-Taliban policy, had to take U-Turn on its policy posture for its survival, political stability and security. Pakistan remained focused on the western block in general and America in particular waged a war against terrorism by joining war against terror.<sup>187</sup>

Afghanistan occupies a central position in the Asian region having close boarder proximities with big major countries like Russia, China and Pakistan. This is the reason that regional big powers are more concerned to this war on terror for their geo-strategic and political gains. War waged in Afghanistan with this suspicion that Al-Qaeda had their hideouts in Afghanistan and Taliban are present in the country who perceived to be supporting the extremist factions in the regional and global level. 188

Though, Islamabad as a client extended full scale cooperation to the patron on all the required levels especially in the war on terror, former deployed its 1 Lakh army personnel on its western boarder to stop the penetration of the terrorist factions in the cross-boarder activities. All the

<sup>188</sup> Malou Innocent, "Pakistan and Future of US policy." *Policy Analysis*, No. 636, April 13 (2009): 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>187</sup> Mehran Gul, "U.S. National Security Strategy: Managing Strategic Partnership in South Asia." *Yale Journal of International Affairs*, Winter (2009): 82.

regional and global powers are trying to control the country to avoid threats to their national and strategic interests. Islamabad supported the United States to dismantle the terrorism from within the country and to cooperate with the western coalition forces in this war against terrorism. Services provided to coalition forces by Islamabad are visible and accepted by the pentagon, however, it demanded the reward for the services it provided in this combat but ironically could never get cooperative stance and sometimes, faced strong opposition and threatened by the patron if did not comply with the patron demands. Islamabad has been vocal for the concerns on the Indian factor when Washington enhanced the strategic partnership with the India on bilateral level.

Afghanistan is direct concerned area for the Islamabad for having close ties with the Taliban as world previously witnessed after effects of the 1979 afghan war when Washington left Kabul in a civil war like situation and Pakistan had to face the consequences with its full political and economic implications. Pakistan as a strategic ally is vital for the United States interests because Washington is aware of this reality that without the Pakistan support to win this war is almost impossible. Islamabad faced serious rhetoric of the patron criticism that Islamabad is supporting the Taliban and sponsoring the extremism and terrorism to keep the Kabul instable and insecure.

Moreover, the United States is much vigilant of this reality that Pakistan has close social and political ties with Afghanistan. Washington realizes that Islamabad is a necessary element in terms of cooperation in Afghanistan to defeat the terrorist and take the war to the logical conclusion. Since 2009, Washington is making withdrawal policy that seems almost impossible without the support of Pakistan to achieve the required objectives. On the hand, the United States is making strong strategic partnership with India in military and political realms. One of the dominating features of this is civil-nuclear deal between both the strategic allies. This is also a reality that though, Washington has close strategic ties with New Delhi but it may be used for long term strategic interests in the region might be to contain emerging China in near future.

Pakistan is cooperating more effectively on tactical level and of course India can not be replacement of it, on the tactical level. Both the client and patron are cooperating bilaterally, Islamabad is presenting the services and conducted two major operations on the demand of the patron but the Washington many times violated the sovereignty and autonomy of the client in Salala air attacks and Abbotabad operation so Islamabad opposed the policies of the Washington

in reaction to that and make them realized if they did not stop violation then Pakistan will take stern action against them and suspended the NATO supply line which latter on opened when immense pressure was put against Pakistan. The patron may support of and don't take notice of non-compliance on small issues but punish on non-compliance on larger strategic issues.<sup>189</sup>

#### **Indian Factor**

India has strong strategic, political and military partnership with the United States. Alliance of Pakistan and the United States has never been permanent but event oriented and there was no element of permanence in this long partnership ever since the start of this relationship. Washington always took India into considerations for the attainment of larger strategic interests in the region, however, Islamabad taken into confidence for tactical level support and hence there was no element of permanence. So far as the concern of this alliance between Washington and Islamabad, it seems quite obvious as it is temporary and short-term.

Pakistan always feel need of the US for its survival due to threats from India. The US is important for Pakistan in terms of military, political and economic while for the US strategic location of Pakistan is more vital than any other interest. These security relations came on many occasions when misperceptions prevailed on both sides. After the cold war, the US has been more concerned to nuclear programme, missile proliferation and terrorism. Pakistan took support in terms of military and economy to strengthen itself against India while the US used Pakistan land, air and ports previously against soviets and now in Afghanistan.

In the post cold war era Pakistan suddenly listed her significance and strategic importance as soviets had withdrawn from Afghanistan and the US stopped all the assistance to Pakistan and revised the policy towards Pakistan, so the security relationship between Pakistan and the US reached to the logical conclusion. The US took a turn towards India as Pakistan lost her importance as a strategic ally. The US considered India as a rising power that can contain China and help to counter Islamic ideology. <sup>190</sup>

After the cold war Pakistan suffered military and economic sanctions in shape of presslar amendment. During the Clinton era policy of the US was to maintain balanced approach towards

<sup>189</sup> ihid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>190</sup> Naeem Ahmed, "Re-defining Pakistan US Relations." the Dialogue, No. 3, Vol. 7, September (2007): 224.

Pakistan and India. However, bush administration tilted towards the India leaving alone the cold war ally against Soviets. Bush policy focused on India as a counter balance of china and to curb Islamic fundamentalism.

The US has a great interest in the stability of the Pakistan internally in terms of economy and military to make it secure from external threats either that is Soviet Union, Afghanistan or Iran. On the larger perspective, the US wanted a stable South Asian region by having good relations between India and Pakistan. It is crucial for the US in both geographical and strategic terms. Although, India tried at all level to keep the US away from Pakistan after the terrorist attacks by offering all kind of support and intelligence sharing but failed because the US needed Pakistan support at large scale to counter the terrorist elements.

Pakistan-US relations cannot be conducted on bilateral terms. However, primary objective of the United States can be to facilitate the both of the South Asian States for good bilateral ties, even though the US is not in a position to shape the regional dynamics of the South Asian region.

At present the US interests in the region is to engage with India for economic and commercial interests and with Pakistan to avoid future anarchy. Another reason of the US involvement in the region is to avoid the nuclear war between India and Pakistan and to prevent the Chinese influence in the region. Obviously, the US policy in South Asia is above the India and Pakistan, New Delhi is at odds with the US as they have a disagreement with Washington on many regional and global issues and dislike her involvement in the regional issues. However, Pakistan welcomes the superpower presence in the region to counter the hegemonic designs of India. The US sees Pakistan democratic system in a mutually beneficial way and is very calculated in its strategic expectations and realistic in her actions. The US wants to go with Pakistan in a realistic way apparently may be on a parity equation but there exists a client-patron relation between both the states.

However, it requires a recognition that client-Patron relationship can not survive between the Strategic allies for a longer period if there is non-recognition to clients interests. It is obvious that Pakistan is a mature international actor and must dealt with sovereign equality and realistic way that has characterized the relationship between Pakistan and India that has remained for a longer period of time. Pakistan and the US know and recognize the importance of their mutual

relationship and limitations. Pakistan has not been a high priority in the US foreign policy but given weightage due to its strategic location in the volatile region.<sup>191</sup>

There are many things that one partner can do for other that's why US has abandoned its policy of disengagement and have adopted the policy of engagement after terrorism crises. The US needs close and friendly relations with Pakistan for peace, security and survival of the South Asian region. On the other side of the picture, for the future, the US focuses mainly on India for the fulfillment of prime interests in the region in all political, economic and military terms. The US is over-taking the strategic partnership by giving unique importance to India. So in such situation the US would have a leverage to reduce economic and military assistance to Pakistan. Despite all of this US can overrule her partnership with Pakistan because of her residual interests and future challenges in the region. 192

Washington's attitude towards conflict between India and Pakistan has been least concerned because it wanted to avoid being pulled into taking sides. This idea dates back to the Kennedy era in early sixties, he had clarified his counterpart Ayub khan that while there was an urgent need of the solution of Kashmir problem, yet he was not in a position to play an active and direct role in the matter. Picture seems very clear in this regard, Washington wanted to maintain its superpower status in the region in general and globe in particular. To control the regional politics, it needed to have close ties with New Delhi along with close strategic partnership. The United States having the objective to maintain superpower status for which it needed regional powers support and cooperation. To understand the United States there is a quote by the French foreign minister Hubert Vedrine, "the United States is a hydro power one that dominates the globe economically, politically, militarily and culturally". With the disintegration of its former patron, the Soviet Union, India is anxious to develop close ties with the US. India is totally relying on the United States IT market for the growth. As a part of its aspirations to become a regional power, India desires a permanent seat in the Security Council, something that it can not materialize without the support of the United States.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>191</sup> Anatol Lieven, "The Pressures on Pakistan." *Foreign Affairs*, Council on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 81, No. 1, February (2002): 117. Available on: <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/20033006">http://www.jstor.org/stable/20033006</a>. Accessed on: 29/11/2002.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>192</sup> Mehran Gul, "U.S. National Security Strategy: Managing Strategic Partnership in South Asia." *Yale Journal of International Affairs*, Winter (2009): 73.

Ahmed Faruqui, Mushraff's Pakistan, Bush's America & the Middle East (Lahore: Vanguard Press, 2008), 83.
 Hubert Verdine, France in An Age of Globalization (USA: Brooking Institution Press, 2001), 12.

Recent events made it very clear that Washington does not want the conflict between India and Pakistan to escalate into a full scale war that can easily become nuclear war, with serious consequences for South Asian security.<sup>195</sup>

India never remained on top priority for the cooperation against the terrorism for the role which Pakistan can play quite impressively while New Delhi has not been totally neglected it also played role but Pakistan has been on priority agenda of the Washington for cooperation in the war on terror. Moreover, geo-strategic proximity of the Pakistan with Afghanistan makes it more relevant and effective for cooperation as compare to India. It is ironic on the part of Washington that New Delhi is getting much more while examine its role in war on terror with comparison to Pakistan. It clearly shows the double standards of the patron that suppressed the dependent state accordingly since it gave no weightage to it of that level in reward. Washington has not paid due attention for the solution of Kashmir nor put pressure on India to sort this matter out sincerely. Another most disturbing factor for the client states is Washington defense cooperation pact with India that itself shows the violation of IAEA.

The United States foreign policy in this region is working on two fronts, firstly, it is has strategic alliance with Pakistan in the war on war terror to win war in Afghanistan and to get safe withdrawal after the successful negotiations with the Taliban with the cooperation of Pakistan. Secondly, it is enhancing strategic ties with India by having their role in Kabul for the attainment of limited level objectives and made defense pacts for larger strategic gains to contain China in the region and to keep strong hold of this region in future via New Delhi. Islamabad and Washington relationship is actually transforming with slow pace from one stage of relationship to another stage. Many diplomatic changes are taking place in this regard in global political arena that might shift the focus of politics in near future. If Islamabad decreases its dependence on the patron then it might lead it to the independent foreign policy and may shift its attention to other emerging powers at regional and global level. It would not be wrong to mention that in this complex world of politics cliental relations can only survive if there is cooperation on bilateral

Accessed on: 29/11/2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>195</sup> Teresita C. Schaffer and Richa Gulati, "High Stakes for the United States and Pakistan." *South Asia Monitor*, Center for Strategic and International Studies, March 1(2002): 37.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>196</sup> Robert G. Wirsing and James M. Roherty, "the United States and Pakistan." *International Affairs* (Royal Instidute of International Affairs), Vol. 58, No. 4, Autumn (2002): 607. Available on: <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/2618471">http://www.jstor.org/stable/2618471</a>.

level otherwise; it would not survive for longer period of time and would lead to the stage of estranged clientage as now Pakistan and the United States are reaching. This stage would definitely bring non-compliance behavior and conflict and thaw like situation that would enormously dispose off the strategic partnership of client and patron.

## Russia, China and Iran Emerging Threats to the US Hegemony

The global politics in the post terrorist attacks is undergoing through drastic changes particularly after the 9/11 events. With the emergence of regionalism, America faces threat perception in the volatile region of South Asia. Afghanistan is in war like situation while big powers observing the whole scenario for the future course of action for the success of their national interests and to counter the America's great game policies. Two most dominating actors, china and Russia are more relevant in this regard who can influence the regional politics and having the potential to disturb the United States hegemonic designs in the coming years. Pakistan the client state of the Washington, sometimes, shows mode of non-compliance on the strategic issues which lead this partnership to the problematic situation that compels the patron to be aggressive and punitive versus the client. Since the initial years Pakistan policies have been west centered and gave less weightage to all other options at regional and global level. However, in the post 9/11 phase, as the dynamics of the world politics changed the trends and ethos of the regional politics also transformed.<sup>197</sup>

Though, Islamabad had certain concerns and was compelled to join the war on terror but quite soon realized the double standards policies of the Washington when a civil nuclear deal signed with New Delhi that brought severe implications for the regional peace and security along with political implication. Pakistan a client state favored the patron on the most critical issue of the terrorism in the war on terror but rewarded much less as compare to services. Moreover, Islamabad sovereignty and autonomy has been continuously violated despite Pakistan raised many concerns in this regard. Client state realized the reality that patron is using her by ignoring the strategic concerns of the client state and repeatedly broken the sovereignty of the state.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>197</sup> Richard L. Armitage and Samuel R. Burger, "U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan." *Independence Task Force*, Report No. 65, Council on Foreign Relations, New York (2010): 32.

All the factors played their role in the formulation of non-compliant behavior of Islamabad and non-allegiance attitude vis-à-vis Washington. Client states support the patron in most critical issues for political, economic and military requirements.

All these dependencies of Islamabad compelled its policy makers to be compliant for the attainments of her strategic interests in the spectrum of political, economic and security. Though, Islamabad is aware of the Washington policies that this partnership is nothing but a tactical alliance based on certain interests but despite all this it is compelled to join this alliance on war on terror due to geo-political and strategic compulsions. With the analysis of foreign policy of the United States, Islamabad is shifting its policy from unilateralism to multilateralism. An attention is being diverted from west to east and other alliances on the regional level with the shift in foreign policy outlook. In this context, emerging actors on the regional level feel threatened from the policies of the America by remaining present in this strategic region under the excuse of war on terror. Delaying tactics are being used to remain in the region for a longer period of time to get hold of the key strategic locations to contain economic giant China on the one hand while emerging Russia on the other hand. Pakistan as a client for its key strategic location in this region is significant that can be effective in this triangle of the competitive politics. <sup>198</sup>

So, Washington is continuously trying to build strong ties with Islamabad and New Delhi to get hold of the region and contain the emerging regional powers on the regional level to avoid any threat to its longstanding hegemony in near future at the international level. Having said this, Pakistan cooperates with the patron in every sphere to the greater extent but patron never protected the client interests that led Islamabad to look East policy to decrease its reliance on the west in general and America in particular. Of course, Pakistan is still an ally of the United States led war on terror but now it has strong ties with China and started to develop ambivalent relations after a longer period of time and suffered a lot. The patron has not protected the client's strategic and political interests in the region which results sometimes in non-compliance and non-cooperative behavior of the client and Washington emphasis to accept the demands and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>198</sup> Wlater K. Anderson, "A Selective War on Terrorism." The National Bureau of Asian Research, South Asian Regional Studies, Summer (2005): 228.

remain submissive on critical issues by supporting the political and ideological stance of the patron that could be helpful for the attainment of their goals.

Islamabad has developed close ties with other regional actors of Asia like china, Iran and Russia that are perceived real threats to the United States hegemony, as the policy makers shows concerns about this partner. Now world has realized that things are changing with the passage of time so as the trends of politics on global arena. Neither Washington is asserting its policies nor is Islamabad completely independent in the formulation of its policy due to continuous involvement of the super power. Strategic partnership in post 9/11 phase between Washington and Islamabad is undergoing a transformation where patron can assert all the demands and neither policies nor the client is wholly independent.

However, this is very much clear that in post war on terror situation, both the partners would clarify their goals and objective especially Pakistan would be in a position to choose her path for the continuation of her political journey and foreign policy for the prestigious say in the world political affairs. History clearly foretells that dependent and client states are always used by the stronger and bigger states for their interests. The best way in this regard can be to decrease reliance on the patron and follow multilateralism in foreign policy pursuance. <sup>199</sup>

Economic and political dimension of the cliental relations is significant because both of these factors describe the true nature of understanding and cooperation between the strategic partners. The role of economy is vital in the description of this unique relationship how it impacts this partnership. Undoubtedly, economic dependence consolidates the cliental relationship on bilateral level where client completely rely on the patron for the attainment of its interests by providing all the services desired by the patron. On the other, political aspect is also of grave concern in which both the partners have stakes to be fulfilled in the larger context of regional and global level. Islamabad has its own interests of security, stability and respectable survival along with getting full support of the partner on the Kashmir issue and all other sensitive issues in larger interests of the state. Washington not only wants the support on the war terror but also for the fulfillment of its larger economic and political designs in pursuance of which it sometimes ignore the clients interests that causes problems and non-compliant behavior of client.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>199</sup> Musa Khan Jalalzai, The Crises of Pakistan's foreign Policy (Lahore: Ameer Sameer, 1999), 256.

Such uncertainties are continuously creating suspicion in the minds of strategic partners and leading to the stage of estranged clientage. If it continued then it may cause the breakup of the strategic partnership between Islamabad and Washington in near future by bringing severe implications.<sup>200</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>200</sup> Shahid M. Ameen, *Pakistan Foreign Policy: A Re-Appraisal* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2009), 317.

#### Conclusion

The thesis has focused on the cliental relationship between two strategic partners Pakistan and the United States in the post 9/11 era. It explains that Pakistan being a weak partner is dominated by the United States in pursuance of interest based policies in the region. Despite policy divergences partnership is functional though, on the lowest working level but for certain compulsions for Islamabad in terms of devastating security, economic instability and growing political concerns on the regional and global level. The United States pursue carrot and stick policy in case of Pakistan and give few relaxations till the completion of task on the less severe issues and keep the cooperation closer till the mission is successful. However, many irritants have started erupting between Pakistan and the United that can be catalysts to change the nature of relationship. Undoubtedly, this relationship is moving to the other dimensions of cliental politics due to increased objections and reluctance to comply with the policies of the Washington. It is evident from the historic facts that this relationship has been event-oriented and task specific for a short time period. It always lacks the permanence and durability that ultimately decrease the worth of this partnership in the eyes of world over.

Keeping in view the past and present nature of bilateral relations of Pakistan and the United States, it is almost impossible to predict the short-term and long-term future of relationship between the partners; however, it can be possible to analyze the expected situations based on ongoing scenario. It is crystal clear that the relationship between Islamabad and Washington is transforming with the changing trends of global politics. Moreover, the cliental relationship has been dominating the strategic partnership that would seldom revert back. The current nature of cliental relationship explains that this partnership is reaching to the level of 'estranged clientage' would continue for short period of time. However, in the long run 'sustainable' equality might retain the weightage when actual stake's of Islamabad will be given due consideration.

Whatsoever, this is a reality that Pakistan has been and will remain amongst the close allies of the US not only in the South, West and Central Asia but at the global level. In this era of technological advancement Pakistan will remain a physical and cultural bridge between West and East and critical juncture for the Washington policies in the region. So, Islamabad and Washington would definitely cooperate with each other on the issues of mutual threats as the in war on terror in the regional context.

Disparity on national interests will lead Pakistan to take a different stance that can be opposite to the Washington interests. The real challenge to Pakistan-United States partnership will be to respect each other policy priorities and respective interests to maintain the cordial relations on bilateral level. To respect the bilateral interests and compromise the less important issues can bring harmony, cordiality and long life to the relationship. Washington can pragmatically tailor her policies towards Pakistan by giving it due significance in the region. If the United States provides support to Pakistan economically and diplomatically then there would be least chances of Pakistan tilting towards other the emerging powers of the world. It is quite obvious that positive and constructive relations between both the states can be constructed only if both the states desire to solve all the confronted issues and workout to solve them pragmatically. Bilateral cordial relations can be the output if Washington gives due importance to the vested interest of the Islamabad and address its security concerns with the enhancement of its significance as compare to India at the regional level.

Pakistan has been the client of United since its inceptions for its certain policy priorities. This cliental partnership is as long as the age of Pakistan itself. However, dynamics of world politics has been changed in the post 9/11 phase. It has not only changed the trends of politics but opened a new horizon of diplomacy and foreign policy on the bilateral level. Pakistan joined the war on terror and took a u-turn on its ongoing policies after analyzing all the existing options in the broader interests of its security, survival and economic stability. Terrorism emerged as a lethal weapon for the human being after the terrorist attacks on America. Pakistan being a proponent of peace and security in the world joined to counter terrorism to avoid its severe implications on the country in general and region as a whole. However, unequal treatment on the part of superior partner regarding regional issues between Pakistan and India creates suspicion about the sincerity of the Washington. It reveals that Pakistan-US relations go on with the changed geo-strategic and political environment in specific direction within a certain time frame. It is time tested thing that it always lacked the consistency and durability due to ideological disparities in the political issues. In the post terrorist attacks phase it went in a complex and unique patterns of interactions due to newly emerging challenges and changed policy postures.

American close ties with military administrator uncover its hidden agenda to meet its strategic designs on the global level to maintain monopoly and hegemonic status under the pretext of democratic values and peace. United States always show reluctance to treat Pakistan on parity level rather follow the policy to materialize its own policies to achieve certain set objective by using Pakistan. It always avoided bringing Islamabad on the same footing as it treat New Delhi. Ironical, despite many sacrifices Islamabad could never establish an image of trustworthy partner in the eyes of US.

Cliental politics involve multiple factors that are involved in the strategic partnership of Pakistan and the United States. However, economic, political and social dimension are significant while discussing the relationship of cliental politics. It is obvious that security and economic dimensions of the theory are prevailing to the relationship and play crucial role. Ideological dimension of the cliental relations is quite unique and important one because Washington wanted to proliferate to the capitalistic ideology with the support of its clients throughout the world to maintain its superpower status with its strong hold on the economic system of the world. However, it will be only possible if its capitalistic ideology dominates all over the world. Religious dimension is also relevant on the part of patron state because it also wanted the domination of Christian civilization as prescribed by the Huntington and wanted to make subordinate to the Muslim ideology by subduing it in the long run. Moreover, Islamabad played significant role in the ideological domination of Washington by joining the capitalistic block headed by the United States. Islamabad joined the strategic alliance despite diverging ideologies perhaps for the promotion of capitalistic ideology not in the religious dimension but just to preserve its security, political and economic interests.

Usually, small states join those stronger states with whom they have ideological affinity and this aspect makes the cliental relationship very strong. In the case study of Islamabad and Washington both the partners have diverging ideologies but are still on the level of certain cooperation because they have other vested interests that are affiliated with this strategic partnership on individual level. Client's stakes of great concern are attached with this partnership. On the other hand, patron has the long tradition of linking ideology with its foreign policy. In this realm both the states are on the policy of convergence despite diverging beliefs because America is pursuing its ideological-cum foreign policy throughout the world to ensure

peace and democracy. The Islamabad is supporting the patron's ideology despite divergence however, other factors seems more significant having greater weigtage.

Moreover, both the partners as strategic allies have certain security perspectives on their respective fronts while expecting a certain level of cooperation from each other. Theoretically, patron ensures the security of the client in return of the client's cooperation in the political and military objectives of the patron. Ironically, this is a most problematic dimension of the client and patron partnership because at present, security dynamics has become most relevant and prevailing perspectives for the states in global anarchical system. Security concerns are quite visible in the states foreign policies whether it is America or any other under-developed state but intensity level on the basis of priorities can be different in this realm. However, in case of Pakistan and the United States there is altogether different state of affairs where Washington is making Islamabad's security and stability vulnerable with the continuous drone attacks which some times, lead Pakistan to be reluctant and non-cooperative occasionally. It seems that cliental relationship between Pakistan and the US is going through the transition for divergent policies and lack of consideration to Islamabad's Interests.

Increased economic dependence of Pakistan is leading it to compromise its independence and sovereignty in the long run because Washington is pursuing her policies openly in the strategic region of the world. Drone attacks has violated all the rules of state sovereignty that is causing instability in the state and deteriorating law and order situation in the country. Pakistan have supported the United State by all means in the war on terror even by losing thousands of lives of its military personnel yet it has failed to get US support on the Kashmir issue. Being an Islamic state Pakistan possesses different ideology and outlook but despite that extended full support to the US ideology-cum policies. Islamabad almost always supported Washington policies and actions yet it could never get the leverage on the equal level of India. This undue support and cooperation of the United States for New Delhi has created imbalance and instability on the regional level by creating suspicion and distrust for the patron. The Economic and political dimension of the cliental relations is significant because both of these factors describe the true nature of understanding and cooperation between the strategic partners.

The role of economy is vital in the description of this unique relationship how it impacts this partnership. Undoubtedly, economic dependence consolidates the cliental relationship on bilateral level where client completely rely on the patron for the attainment of its interests by providing all the services desired by the patron. On the other, political aspect is also of grave concern in which both the partners have stakes to be fulfilled in the larger context of regional and global level. Islamabad has own interests of security, stability and respectable survival along with getting full support of the partner on the Kashmir issue and all other sensitive issues in larger interests of the state.

The cliental relationship existed between Pakistan and the US with entire dimensions but now circumstances are changing with the changed regional and global scenario. This bilateral strategic partnership would take a new turn with all its implications at the regional and global level. It is now impossible for the US to get complete dominance over the Pakistan while assertion for the complete independence is also impossible for the Islamabad. This situation can be improved with the positive attitude and constructive policies that both the partners secure interests of each other and especially the Pentagon has to play more effective role by giving due respect to the interests of Islamabad so that it could avoid to go to other emerging powers on the global political arena.

This is a ground reality now that neither Pakistan can be independent completely nor the United States can assert full dominance on it so this relationship is in a transitional phase that can result into the cooperation if both the strategic partner does not avoid the concerns of the other partner and give importance to their vested interests. The weaker state always play the role of client state and render all the services as required by the patron whether military, intelligence sharing or global policy making but if the patron does not ensure the security of the client and its vested interests then it would ultimately result into the non-compliance behavior or can reach to the stage of break up. Pakistan is in a position diplomatically and geo-strategically to play a major role in the America's global strategic designs and war on terror because this South Asian region is very important for the United States in their global designs.

So, Pakistan's role in the region can be a threat to the United States policies if it wanted so it can definitely shake the policies of the US in the region if it perceives their policies dangerous to their existence and defense. Pakistan having the greater will of autonomy and independence from US and rejected the subordinating and compliant behavior many time. Three main factor are influential in cliental relationship are becoming more irrelevant due to the US military involvement in many world disputes because it is decreasing its military strength in the region while many policy disagreements are erupting between Pakistan and the United States, it is considered by the world community that this relationship would no longer survive.

The Changing dynamics of the complex world politics has made it matter of great concerns to understand and analyze the policy priorities and foreign policy making of the world. The most striking feature with the reference to the significance of the study of Foreign policy making is that what are those interests which policy makers keep on top most agenda because in the modern times policy making has become very significant phenomenon in this anarchical world of politics and how they maintain their status, pursue national interest and affect the political and diplomatic world accordingly.

Pakistan-US relations have been undergoing fundamental restructuring. There have been continuous constraints and opportunities for strategic partnership. The US has been apprehensive of many issues regarding Pakistan like its fair role in the war on terror, insecurity of nuclear weapon programme and Pakistan's close ties with Afghanistan, China and Iran due to its geographical proximities and having close affiliations in multiple sectors. On the other hand, Pakistan has always been apprehensive of Washington's double standard and suspicious about her motives as a threat to Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity having close ties with India, by considering the past history of events. So the case study is significant to understand the policy making at state, regional and international level of both the leading countries in international politics in a volatile region of the world. Pakistan's placement in the Asian region and geo-strategic location make it point of grave concerns for super power. It has become significant to understand the complex dynamics of politics in the contemporary word.

The nature of relations between both the strategic allies has reached to somewhat, at the 'estranged clientage' where client breaks the ties by becoming non-compliant and become reluctant when patron crosses the threshold by ignoring the security and sovereignty of the

dependent state. Continuous non-compliance can cross the threshold of hearting stalemate by resulting in the discontinuation of strategic partnership with its effect with the creation of suspicion and distrust on the part of both the states in future course of action. This output would be detrimental not only for the interests of the Islamabad but also for the greater designs of Washington in the long run. Such emerging scenario would be dangerous for the patron's hegemonic designs. In this way it will not be wrong to say that breakup would not only disturb the regional equation but is capable of turning the prevailing political system. Cliental relation is much in favor of America for the success of its war on terror and other global designs to maintain its hegemony in the world over. This is only possible if the interests of Islamabad are protected in terms of security and development of military capabilities on bilateral level. Another major irritant that can be harmful for this strategic partnership is increased cooperation with New Delhi in civil-nuclear and technological level that can be lethal for the client's minimum credible deterrence. Even if it is not avoided in the agenda of Washington then both the enemy states should be dealt on equal footing to maintain the equality and peace in the region ultimately. Cliental relationship would maintain its credible viability if both the partners preserve mutual interests and it would definitely consolidate the clientalship and seems inevitable for the patron's security and political solidarity in the broader picture. It clearly defines the client's strength due to its geo-strategic location in the most volatile region and being present at the cross roads of the future emerging powers that are competitors of Washington. That's why Islamabad having a greater significance in the eyes of America because it most relevant client that can play role for the greater interests of the Pentagon.

The tragic events of 9/11 have totally changed the dynamics of politics on the regional and global level. The relationship of client-patron between Pakistan and the United States has remained for a longer period of time but now trends have been changing because Pakistan is a key actor state at the regional level. However, one important aspect of this relationship is dependency on the patron which consolidates the client-patron relationship. However, double standard policies of the patron made the client desperate many times because of having developed close ties with India. It is pertinent to know in case of Islamabad and Washington relations, how they are still each other's close allies despite many disparities on political, economic and ideology. It is necessary to note here that it is security, geo-strategic politics,

convergence of interests or other factors which define their foreign policy priorities in cliental relationship.

Washington not only wants the support on the war terror but also for the fulfillment of its larger economic and political designs in pursuance of which it sometimes ignores the clients' interests that causes problems and non-compliant behavior of client. Such uncertainties are continuously creating suspicion in the minds of strategic partners and leading to the stage of estranged clientage. If it continued then it may cause the breakup of the strategic partnership between Islamabad and Washington in near future by bringing severe implications. Moreover, Pakistan is more relevant to the solution of Afghanistan on terror and in its withdrawal policy because it is almost impossible to win the war on terror without the help of Pakistan and negotiates successfully with Taliban. Divergent approaches towards the Afghanistan's issue and casual response towards security sensitivities of Pakistan vis-à-vis India has further aggravated the situation on the bilateral level. Islamabad can play decisive role in the negotiations if it is taken into confidence and assured that the history will not repeat itself again. It is only possible in the present case scenario if the continuous drone attacks would be stopped to maintain the sovereignty of the state and to control such elements. Truly, the ongoing drone attacks will continue even after the restoration of democratic government because of weak position of the state. Apart from this, the strategic location of Pakistan makes it more important actors at the crossroads of Central Asian, South East Asian Countries where China, Russia and Iran are major irritants and challenges to the United States monopoly. These countries can challenge the hegemony of the superpower if kept on growing with the same pace. Card of Pakistan can be played anytime by the US against these emerging countries both states remained close partners for a longer period of time. However, break up with Pakistan can bring severe implications for the hegemony of the United States in the long by minimizing its influence.

Pakistan is vital for the interests of the Unites States policies in South Asia. The objectives of Washington are affected by what happens in Pakistan and its relations with country. The issue is complicated because Pakistan opposes the many policy strategies of United States especially when it is pro-India. The role of Drone attacks and US military inside Pakistan is very contentious. Strategy of the United States in region must be based on the understanding of Islamabad objectives. If the United States continued the same policy rules to negate the stakes of

the partner sooner or later it would lead to the break up that would more detrimental for the United States hegemony. However, on the other hand, cooperation on the mutual level on equal footing can strengthen the cliental relationship at the level of sustainable equality. People distrust can be removed only if the United States develops the partnership on the mutual understanding in the post 9/11. It seems almost impossible that cliental relations will prevail to the Pakistan and United States relations any more. However, both the states are on the stage of estranged clientage where Pakistan sometime show non-compliance or opposes the policies of the Washington. The understanding the crucial and unchangeable interests of each other on mutual level can transfer this estranged clientage scenario into sustain equality. The need of the hour is to remove the entire irritants that are encountering the stability of the relation in a pragmatic way. Relations between the partners can be made better if the United State will give due consideration to Pakistan and diplomatic support on all the political issues to avoid Pakistan tilt towards other emerging powers.

Islamabad is suspicious about the long run intention of the United States in the region. Actually, Pakistan is concerned of the situation in tribal areas and Afghanistan when the United States would depart from the region. It will bring dire impacts on the security and stability of Pakistan and regional political dynamics. This fear is present because of Washington's episodic engagement in the region in the past days. The situation is alarming in the region after the withdrawal of the United States from Afghanistan that will directly affect Pakistan's security and stability. The best way to deal with the situation will be that United States give consideration to Islamabad's stakes and assure the rehabilitation and political stability in the region. Unless pragmatic approach is not followed by keeping the stake holders on board by the United States peace cannot achieved in the region. Aggression is the solution of nothing but an opening of new aggression that will bring severe implications for regional security and stability. It is evident from the history that peace and stability is not achieved in battle ground but by winning the hearts and minds of the people.

People of Pakistan are suspicious about the intentions of the United States in the region because it seldom gives importance to the interests of Islamabad that endorses almost all its policies. After the 9/11 events the relationship evolved in new dimensions but question mark remained on the sincerity of the partner. Despite increased dependence on bilateral level the credibility of the

cliental relationship is zero due to certain reservations of parties and trust remained far apart from friendship. Another main concern that can be dealt wisely to decrease the intensity of tension between strategic partners on US part by decreasing its ties with Ne Delhi and it would be only possible if the United States engage India to solve the Kashmir Issue. Political dimension is very important along with economic aspect because positive role played by the United States can harmonize the relations by rooting out the inherent distrust. Pakistan is supporting Unites States despite ideological disparity but it has given significance to other factors to maintain the status quo in the region to avoid disharmony. Continues drone attacks are spoiling the sovereignty because economic dependence has weakened its sovereignty where now it usually tries to attain more independence and assert her complete sovereignty. This lead to the level of estranges clientage from where this relation can break up or sustainable equality. Second option is much desired outcome because it persists for a long time and maintains partnership for longer period of time. Understanding all the problems is a pragmatic strategy to cope with all the issues and avoid all the future uncertainties and confrontations. Due consideration to mutual interests strengthen the cliental relationship in the long run and remove the element of suspicion for future effective course of actions. Tolerance towards the religion Islam by the America can solve almost all the problems and will finish all the aggressive posture towards each other if it shows modesty to the region. The long term partnership between Pakistan and United States can stabilize the regional security and stability of South Asia.

## Bibliography

Abbas, Hassan. Pakistan's Drift into Extremism. New Delhi: Pentagon press, 2005.

Ahmed, Ishtiq. "the Spectre of Islamic Fundamentalism over Pakistan (1947-2007)." in *Pakistan Regional and Global Politics*, edited by Rajshree Jetly. New Delhi: Routledge Publisher, 2009.

Ahmed, Ishtiaq. "Pakistan and Patrons: The United States, China and Saudi Arabia." *Institute of South Asian Studies*, ISAS Working Group, No. 135, October (2011): 7.

Ahmed, Mutahir. "The Prospects of Islamic Fundamentalism in the Post Cold War Era." *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 48, no. 2 (April 1995): 53. <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/41393516">http://www.jstor.org/stable/41393516</a> accessed on: 20/05/2013.

Akbar, M.J. Tinderbox- The Past and Future of Pakistan. New Delhi: HarperCollins, 2011.

Ali shah, Syed Muhammad. "Pakistan and the war against terrorism." *Pakistan institute of international affairs*, Pakistan horizon, Vol. no. 6, no.2, Pakistan foreign policy analysis (2007): 85-107. www.jstor.org.

Ahmed, Naeem. "Re-defining Pakistan US Relations." the Dialogue, No. 3, Vol. 7, September (2007): 224.

Agha, Ayesha Siddiqa. "Pakistan Security Percpetions." in *Security and Nuclear Stabilization in South Asia*, edited by Imtiaz Alam. Lahore: Free Media Foundation, 2006.

Akhtar, Shahnaz. "Dynamics of US-Pakistan Relations in the Post 9/11 Period: Hurdles and Future Prospectus." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 11, June (2012): 207-11.

Ameen, Shahid M. Pakistan Foreign Policy: A Re-Appraisal. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Amin, Shahid M. Pakistan's foreign policy. UK: Oxford University Publisher, 2010.

Anderson, Walter K. "A Selective War on Terrorism." *The National Bureau of Asian Research*, South Asian Regional Studies, Summer (2005):228.

*Independence Task Force*, Report No. 65, Council on Foreign Relations, New York (2010): 32. Armitage, Richard L. and Samuel R. Burger, "U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan."

Ali, Zulifgar. Pak US Relations Pre-9/11Era. Lahore: Peace Publications, 2013.

Amin, Shahid M. Pakistan's Foreign Policy. UK: Oxford University Publisher, 2010.

Armstrong, David and Joseph Trento. *America and the Islamic Bomb*. New Hampire: Steer Forth Press, 2007.

Azmi, M. Raziullah. *Pakistan American Relations: The Recent Past.* Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1994.

Barak, Dan, Eirav Yogev and Yorem Schewitzer. "A Trouble Geo-Strategic Marriage: US Pakistan Relations." *Military and Strategic Affairs*, Vol. 3, No. 2, September (2011): 37.

Butt, Usama, Julian Schofield, eds. *Pakistan: the US, Geopolitics and Grand Strategies*. London: Pluto Press, 2012.

Carney, Christopher P. "International Patron-Client Relationship: A Conceptual Framework." Comparative International Development Studies, summer, No. 2 (1989): 46-49.

Cohen, Stephen P. *India*: *Emerging Power*. Washington D.C.: The Brooking institution press, 2002.

Cohen, Stephen P. The Future of Pakistan. Washington D.C.: The Brooking Institution, 2001.

Fair, Christine. "The Counter terror Coalitions: Cooperation with Pakistan and India." *United States Institute of Peace*, August (2005): 5-6.

Faruqui, Ahmed. Musharraf's Pakistan, Bush's America & the Middle East. Lahore: Vanguard Publisher, 2008.

Grare, Fredric. Pakistan and the Afghan conflict 1979-1985. UK: Oxford Press, 2003.

Grare, Fredric. "Re-thinking Western Strategies Towards Pakistan: An Agenda for the United States and Europe." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, September (2007): 27.

Guihong, Zhang. "US security policy towards south Asia after September 11<sup>th</sup> and its implications for China: A Chinese Perspective." *DuPont Circle*, Washington, January (2003): 13. <a href="https://www.stimpson.org">www.stimpson.org</a>. Accessed on 1/4/2010.

Gul, Mehran. "U.S. National Security Strategy: Managing Strategic Partnership in South Asia." *Yale Journal of International Affairs*, Winter (2009): 82.

Hadar, Leon T. "Pakistan in America's War Against Terrorism." *Policy Analysis*, No. 436, May 2 (2002): 3.

Haider, Ziad. "Ideological Adrift," In *Pakistan Beyond Crises State*, edited by Maleeha Loodhi. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Haq, Noor Ul. "Unipolarism and US-Pakistan Relations." *Institute of Policy Research Islamabad* (IPRI), Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter (2006):103.

Harrison, Salig S. "Pakistan: The State of the Union." Center for International Policy, April 2009, 24.

Herbert Wilkinson, kitschelt. eds. *Patrons, Clients, and Policies. Patterns of Democratic. Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Herd, Graeme P., ed. *Great Powers and Strategic Stability in 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Competing Vision of World Order.* New York: Routledge, 2010.

Hilali, A. Z. US Pakistan Relationship. United States: Aghast Publishing Company, 2005.

Hilali, A.Z. *US – Pakistan Relations: Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan*. USA: Asghate Publishing Company, 2005.

Hussain, Aftab. "Strained US-Pakistan ties Threaten Region." *Islamabad Policy Research Institute* (IPRI), January 4 (2013): 24.

Hussain, Irfan. Fatal Fault lines, Pakistan, Islam and the West. New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2012.

Hussain, Khadim. The Militant Discourse. Islamabad: BPH Publisher, 2013.

Hussain, Rizwan. *Pakistan and Emergence of Islamic Militancy in Afghanistan*. England: Asghate Publishing Company, 2005.

Hussain, Zahid. "Battling Militancy." In *Pakistan Beyond Crises State*, Edited by Maleeha Loodhi. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Hussain, Zahid. Frontline Pakistan. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.

Innocent, Malou. "Pakistan and Future of US policy." *Policy Analysis*, No. 636, April 13 (2009): 3.

Jalalzai, Musa Khan. The Crises of Pakistan's foreign Policy. Lahore: Ameer Sameer, 1999.

Jalalzai, Musa Khan. *Pakistan*, *Islam*, *Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*. Lahore: Career Book Publisher, 2006.

Jalalzai, Musa Khan. The Crises of Pakistan's Foreign Policy. Lahore: Ameer Sameer publisher, 1999.

Javed, Ambreen and Zulifqar Ali. "War on Terror Partnership: Problems and Prospects for Pakistan." *Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 20, issue-1 (2013): 18.

Jonnes, Owen Bennet. Pakistan Eye of the Storm. London: Yale University Press, 2002.

Khan, Nasir Akbar. "The US Policy of Target Killing by Drones in Pakistan." *IPRI Journal 11*, No. 1, winter (2011): 23.

Khan, Rais Ahmed. ed. Pakistan United States Relations. Islamabad: Pakistan Press, 1983.

Khan, Tariq Amin. *Genealogy of Post-Colonial State in India and Pakistan*. Islamabad: Vanguard Publisher, 2012.

Khan, Tariq Amin. *Genealogy of the Post-Colonial State in India and Pakistan*. Islamabad: Vanguard Publisher, 2012.

Kronstadt, K. Alan. "Pakistan-US Relation." *Congressional Research Service*, the Library of Congress, May 24, 2012.

Lodhi, Maleeha ed. *Pakistan: Beyond the Crises State* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2011), 378.

Loodhi, Maleeha. The External Dimensions. Lahore: Jang Publishers, 1994.

Madalena, Maria, Fischer L. Carvalho, and Matthias Fischer. *Pakistan under Siege: Pakistan after September 11<sup>th</sup>*, 2001. Islamabad: Vanguard Books, 2004.

Malik, Beson. ed. Issues in 21st Century World Politics. England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Malik, Hafeez. Soviet – Pakistan Relations and Post Soviet Dynamics. London: Macmillan Publisher, 1994.

Markey, Daniel. "A False Choice in Pakistan." Foreign Affairs (Council on Foreign Affairs), Vol. 86, No. 4, August (2007): 87.

Mehmood, Farhat. A History of US- Pakistan Relations. Islamabad: Vanguard, 1991.

Muqtedar Khan, M.A. "Nice But Tough: A Framework of US Foreign Policy in the Muslim World." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Issue 1, and Vol. 11 (2002): 356.

M. Hali, Sultan. "Pak-US turning relations." Pakistan Observer, Islamabad, May 20, 2001.

Musharraf, Parvez. In the line of fire. London: Simon and Schuster, 2006.

Nayak, Polly. "US Security Policy in South Asia Since 9/11- Challenges and Implications for the Future." *Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies* (APCSS), February (2005): 5.

Own Bennett, Jones. *Pakistan Eye of the Storm.* London: Yale University Press New Haven, 2002.

Pasha, S.A.M. Islam in Pakistan's Foreign policy. New Delhi: Global media Publications, 2005.