Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR)
p-ISSN 2520-0348, e-ISSN 2616-793X
Vol. II, No. II (Fall 2017) Page: 1 - 23
DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2017(II-II).01
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2017(II-II).01

Pak-US Relations: Understanding of the Misunderstandings

Asghar Khan* Ayaz Ahmad† Amjad Ali Dadda‡

Abstract

This paper critically analyses the US and Pakistan relations in historical context and thereby comprehends the causes of misunderstandings between them, especially under the new administration of Donal Trump. Like other states in our world both Pakistan and USA have priorities to secure their national interests as both have their own way of protecting their interest in short, medium or long terms. The paper finds that unlike the US which makes a policy that focuses only on the current scenarios, Pakistan keeps in view the lessons from past betrayals from US and her future needs arising from her security issues related to her neighbours i.e. Afghanistan and India. Pakistan also fears Indian involvement in Afghanistan and the US support to India in Afghanistan in general and particularly in the region. Pakistan needs to understand US mistrust for rapid proliferation (even legal) to earn easy money to strengthen its weak economy. From the US perspectives, it strategy regarding Pakistan is no different from that of a major powers as she only focuses short terms objectives. USA needs to realize that the strategic location of Pakistan and the nuclear capability makes her an important country that bestows on her the right to be treated like medium power in the region. It not only about dealing with mutual misunderstandings related to realization of mutual concerns but it is also about peace, security and future of every sixth human being on earth who lives in the region or maybe its impacts can go far beyond to the whole world. Therefore, both Pakistan and the US need to address each other's concern and work on converging lines.

Key Words: Pakistan, United States of America, Afghanistan, Indian factor, Afghan War, Security, Nuclear proliferation.

Introduction

International relations are dynamic and states try their best to pursue their interest in international relations. Relations between a big power and small or medium power are ignored by academics and researchers who adopt a narrow view of this subject from one perspective only and thus a comprehensive views is ignored.

*Lecturer, Department of Regional Studies, University of Peshawar, Peshawar, Pakistan.
Email: mian_786pk@yahoo.cm
†Lecturer Department of English, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Mardan, Pakistan.
‡Post Graduate Diploma in Business Management, UK.

© 2017 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Whether, they study realism, liberalism or radicalism they focus only on the specification of foreign policy and international relations where a unilateral perspective of a given state is explored (David Kinsella, et. All, 2012; Guzzini, 2013; Lisa Harrison, 2013 and Iver B. Neumann, 2005). So, a major gap exists in such studies for healthy understanding of the conflicting relations of states in the study of bilateral relations (Neumann, 2005).

States exist in the environment of a community, though humans determine the actions of states yet its well-recognised fact that a state does behave differently than those humans who lead the affairs of states. Unlike humans, states try to keep long term relations within the community of the world. It is a popular quote that there is no permanent foe or permanent friend in world affairs but this fact cannot be easily denied that state to state relations steadily move in a particular direction for long time (Society, 1895; Nikolas, 2013). Though it is necessary for the states' departments of foreign affairs to remain vigilant in respect of day to day changes national, regional and global level.

World War II brought an end to many western colonies leading to the emergence of a number of nascent states mostly on geographic bases. Among these states Pakistan is unique as it emerged from the schism of ethnic identities within a larger state (Hubbard, 2010; West, 2010). According to a view, it was in greater interests of major western powers not to leave geographically big states as those were geographic units when came under some occupations of states mainly in the continents of South America, Africa and Asia. (Kasperson, 2011) These states after their independence were failed to focus on their development towards modernity instead were attracted more towards their security concerns. This feeling of insecurity and growing border conflicts left many of these states with no choice but to join any of the two major military blocks of Russian lead Soviet block and the US lead Western Block, (Reiter, 2013; Commonwealth Advisory Group, 1997; Anders Wivel, 2005) it is worth mentioning that lateral developments lead towards non-alignment movements and post-cold war brought a shift from realism to radicalism in the international affairs where states were left more isolated to redefine their interests and make shifts.

Pakistan and the US relations date back to October 1947 when the formal exchange of diplomats between two states took place, followed by Pakistan's inclusion to Baghdad Pact and received great attention for US when *Badaber* base was used as launching pad for U-2 air planes. (McGarr, 2013) The relations since start were not purely military as Pakistan was then interested in getting US economic aid, technological support, and other benefits, while the US found in Pakistan, a good customer of arms and an ally close to the USSR and China.

The relations between the two states remain more cordial during military rule as compared to the short-lived democratic governments of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Benazir Bhutto, Nawaz Sharif and Asif Ali Zardari. (Caldwell, 2011) Both nations moved from cosy to frigid (or rather tense) relations and developed a level of

mistrust over times. As new situation points to another period of tense relation when Trump as presidential candidate and then as President of the United States (POTUS) announced the new shift in policy for Pakistan and Afghanistan. (Times, 2017)

This paper considers the issues of misunderstandings between Pakistan and the US in historical perspective and suggests how both nations can bring changes in their policies in order to bring ease and comforts into their relations especially considering Afghanistan issues as bone of contention in the current situation. The paper also analyses the current policy announcement by Mr. Donald Trump as POTUS.

Research Question and Approach

This paper is based on historical perspective on Pakistan USA relationships after 1947 as it is very important to understand relations between two states using longer view when we want to get a comparative version, balancing aims, objectives and goals of two nations. It is assumed that in unequal relations between a super power and a small power, the super power prefer short term interests while the small power due to lesser bargain chips relies on long term future oriented relations so it can derive benefits from mutual relations beyond immediate needs of major power. This rationale explains the reason for the small power's desire of having acceptance on behalf of the major power and propensity to tolerate and ignore betrayals when the small power is no more required.

The main objective of this paper is to find the issues of misunderstanding that lead to bitterness and elements of mistrusts in their relationship. The applied methodology is mix of description and analysis. A descriptive methodology is important in current study as mentioned by (Guzzini, 2013). Further, analysis is used to find how the strains in these relations between Pakistan and USA beyond any regional power struggle or competition of rivalry (as it's between India and Pakistan) are based on some misunderstandings to balance each other's interests.

This paper overviews the nature of misunderstandings between the two states that cannot be ignored in finding a mechanism to make their strategic relations work towards positivity for a decisive victory against regional terrorism of all types. This becomes more relevant when Pakistan is being blamed by the US policy makers for their failure in Afghanistan. A historical descriptive study on the topic is essential to see the issues of stress between two states from the US and Pakistani perspective together with an effort to keep it more neutral and unbiased. Various limitations of this study are expected due to lack of sufficient resources, time strains and other typical research constraints that are normally faced in scholarship on topics dealing with international relations. (Harrison & Callan, 2013)

Pak-US relations: A Historical Background

It is important to mention current situation on Pakistan-USA relations before we make a historical and descriptive review of the study. Since the start of US led war on terror Pakistan has joined her as an ally in the war and provided NATO with supply roots and other strategic support viz. provision of its military bases and airports to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan where two superpowers had already failed (Britain and Soviets in 19th and 20th centuries) due to tribal and cultural mind-set of Afghan people who are keen to resist any foreign invasion at any cost. (Bush, 2009)

Pakistan's cooperation in this matter remained critical. However, as the war progressed after the US and her allies were successful in ending Taliban Qandahar based Government and installing of Kabul based Karzai government, US think tank started blaming Pakistani military and its intelligence agency, Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) for supporting Haqqani Group and other Taliban groups (Caldwell, 2011). Pakistan immediately denied such allegations resulting in the Pak-US relations touching its lowest in the past seventeen years (Dalrymple, 2013), while certain incident of capture or death of any Taliban or al Qaeda leader happened inside the territory of Pakistan like killing of Osama Bin Laden (whom Americans declared as prime target of war on terror, though later target was shifted to AL Qaeda, Taliban and eventually US expanded this title to include Iraq as well). On other hand, Pakistan since 1988 is calling for broad-based Afghan government which is accepted and participated by all important war-lords and their factions. This response never garnered universal acceptance by the US and her allies. Further, Pakistan has her own strategic and military fears against regional hegemony of India due to the conflict on centralising issue of Kashmir (Armitage, 2010; Dalrymple, 2013)

In a recent speech, while announcing his foreign policy related to Pakistan and Afghanistan, President Trump came with following points in his future new policy for the region:

1. He came with a note of realisation that the USA needs to accommodate the key version of indigenous democratic solutions for a country like Afghanistan instead trying to populate ideal western democratic system in these countries. (Times, 2017)
2. He found that it's in US interests to look less on the economic and developmental side while engaging in any conflict to ensure her security overseas. (Berman, 2017)
3. He also came with the importance of a multiplicity of strategy while engaging other nations for solutions in specific country or regions. Like diplomatic, political, economic and military. (Berman, 2017)
4. He also announced that his government concern is more towards ISIS and AlQaeda than Afghan Taliban who provides nurseries and support to raise

such anti-US force but may not be an immediate threat to the USA outside Afghanistan. (Times, 2017)

5. He also shared his view to bringing Taliban on to dialogues one way or other. (Times, 2017)
6. He announced a decentralization of command when it is related to operations inside Afghanistan. (Times, 2017)

Related to Pakistan, he not only accepted that Pakistani people suffered a lot from this war in Afghanistan and lost their lives, (Shah M. A., 2017) even he accepted a level of military relations between two nations yet he pointed out harshly that Pakistan must look for the solution of safe havens and sanctuaries of AL Qaeda and Afghan Taliban leadership within her territory (Dutt, 2017). He mentioned sanctuaries of Haqqani network that were targeting US forces continuously since the new war in Afghanistan and assured that the US will not tolerate such sanctuaries and may chase these anti-US elements within Pakistani territory. In Pakistan, this speech was taken as an offensive speech towards Pakistani nation and a threat to her territorial sovereignty. Electronic and print media in Pakistan started debates and discussion to find how Pakistan can respond to this and what are real issues which may require considerations for Pakistan to make ease for US in her war in Afghanistan as these strains were purely related to US's Afghan war and failures after seventeen years of war with most sophisticated war weaponry in the history. Where frustration of US military strategist and government are concerned about Afghanistan. It is understandable that the current feeling in Islamabad pertaining to the question, that why they have been thrashed as an escape goat for failures in Afghanistan while they were sacrificing the lives, property and stability as an ally of the US and NATO (Dimitrakis, 2012). To understand this current situation on both side and level of mistrust we need to look historically how the relations between two states developed since mid-twentieth century till today.

First three decades of relations

We cannot say this was a forced marriage for Pakistan, but it looks to many Pakistani minds that this was one sided love from Pakistan. Ayyub was forced to write "friends not masters" and Pakistani intellectuals, academia and common man especially are still not able to see this relationship otherwise. Pakistan joined SEATO and CENTO military alliance with the US in the 1950s and 1960s. It provided US with launching areas for flying U-2 spying planes to spy over Soviets territories, till U-2 incident happened and pilot Gary Powers' capture led the Soviets to know what was going on, leading to surgical strikes by the USSR in Pakistan (Gvosdev, 2013; Powers, 2001). Pakistan also benefited from joining these military alliances as she got access to new military technologies and training for her armed forces. Pakistan enjoyed economic support from the USA reaching

a net worth of $2.5bn till the start of the 1980s. Pakistan benefited from other supports in educations, science technology like an early adaptation of television technology in 1964 before India could get it. To sum up, the interests of both nations we can get a clue from joint communique released on time of Ayub-Kennedy meeting that stated both stressed the need for the nation of the free world to attain unity to promote international peace and ensure national security (Hussain, 1966). Ayub was presented by American press to American people as Champion of free people, that time cleared about Pakistan's peace and security priorities, the importance of Kashmir for the people of Pakistan, economic needs and willingness to stand with the western world against Soviet Block. (Bindra, 1988)

Later, Pakistan received disappointing responses from the USA when it faced a war with India in 1965, her expectations were not met as per her needs during the war and she was to look beyond SEATO, CENTO and the US support (Rizvi, 1993). This was the start of realisation within Pakistan that they may need to adopt more open and neutral foreign policy approach instead of relying on USA and west for her interest and needs. And thus, in 1970s Pakistani pro-socialist government of ZA Bhutto start efforts to develop better relations with China and even with Russia. In the decades of 50s, 60s, and 70s we do not find considerable traces of US objections or any stress feeling from US side related to Pakistan, though Pakistan was having many complaints related to limitation in the military supports in her wars against India in 1965 and 1971 (that lead to separation of Bengal province as Bangladesh and resulted in the capture of 90000 Pakistani military personals within Bangladesh by Indian Army). Even during that time many of US leadership, officers at foreign office and state department tried their best to explain that their military pacts with Pakistan were purely anti-Soviet and they were not binding to support Pakistan when their country was under attack by another nation. (McMahon, The Cold War in the Third World, 2013) Yet version was not acceptable for Pakistanis that they were in military alliance only to get defence against Soviets while their immediate and real threat was not from Soviets but from Indian.

Again, while there was a civilian government Pakistan was unable to attain enjoyable relations with the USA though she helped the US to develop its relations with growing power of China (Small, 2015). As Pakistan speeded up its nuclear programme, the first sign of concern appeared with in US policy makers regarding Pakistan behaviour and they tried to dissuade Pakistan from achieving nuclear capability. The US failure in doing so stems from failing to satisfy the strategic needs of Pakistan. While they were not willing to fulfil her traditional military needs of advanced military weaponry, on another hand Indians who did not join any western military alliance were smartly enjoying benefits from both blocks (Park, Pempel, & Kim, 2011).

Afghan War of the 1980s

While Pakistan was having stressed relations with the US, a military takeover happened inside Pakistan which was surely not welcomed by US government. Later, the situation took a new turn after Soviet forces invaded Afghanistan and influx of millions of Afghan refugees within Pakistani borders forced both nations to join (Khan, 2013). This time it was again the US which extended her support towards Pakistan instead a successful foreign policy effort by Pakistan and thus the ease in stress and strains of relations were not a Pakistani effort. Under Carter doctrine Pakistan was given $ 3.2 billion during this period. Pakistan also received extended military support and supply of F-16 fighter planes. Pakistan and US indulged in a long-term dialogue that how US will indirectly involve in this war till 1986 when ultimately the US agreed to provide Stinger Missiles to Afghan Mujahideen (Islamists mainly) (Craig & Logevall, 2012). Pakistan military especially her intelligence agency collaborated with the US to launch Operation Cyclone to resist communist regime in Kabul and with other allies' support ISI and CIA took to task for training, equipping, sheltering, treating and logistics for the Afghan Mujahideen. It was not the only US but almost eighty countries including China who contributed in supporting Afghan resistance forces for their long war against one of the super powers (Johnston, 2011; Campbell Craig, 2012; David Kinsella, 2012; Dimitrakis, 2012; McGarr, 2013; and Malik, 2016). Arab fighters were recruited in name of Jihad and a sophisticated Jihadi propaganda was arranged by western powers in Muslim world for years to get free recruiters for this war to save money with strong desire to defeat Soviets and they got success in their efforts mainly contributed by Afghan Islamists, Tribal war lords like Rasheed Dostum, Ahmad Shah Masood, and Muslim foreign fighters like Osama Bin Laden backed by scholars like Abdullah Azzam (Krause & Mallory, 2014).

Once Soviets announced a withdraw and offered an agreement to the US, Americans rushed to go for this neglecting Pakistan's warning against withdrawal of Soviet forces without reaching acceptable solution for coming Afghan power sharing among various factions that fundamentally shared one objective of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan while having multiple conflicting interests which were to surface if not settled before Soviet withdrawal. Zia was also betrayed by his prime minister Junejo on this issues who went to Geneva and signed declaration that was ill-framed without consideration of genuine view of Pakistan Military regime that was very closed to Afghan resistance forces and was in good confidence to understand real concerns of these diverse groups who held powers in multiple regions within Afghanistan (C-SPAN.org, 1989; Rizvi, 1993; Saikal, 2014).

Strain of Relation in the 1990s

Right after withdraw of Soviet forces from Afghanistan and death of military leadership in Pakistan that led to change in government from military to civilians in 1988 the Pakistani Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto visited the USA and addressed a joint session of Congress in June 1989 (C-SPAN.org, 1989). In her speech, she insisted that Russians are not only piling weapons in Kabul but also blaming Pakistan for ongoing bloodshed in Afghanistan which was a matter of her government concern. She stated:

> *"Russian support to Kabul and supplying weapons like Scud missiles which are also targeting inside Pakistan. Soviets have gone but the forces of foreigners continue to deny the ultimate fruits of victory, self-determination and independence to the people of Afghanistan. Those responsible for a decade of death and destruction now blame us for continued bloodshed. They accuse us of interfering into Afghanistan, nothing farther from the truth nothing is more a just." She further stated that "In Pakistan, we would like to see the return of Afghan refugees in peace and dignity. Let us not at this stage out of impatience lose the opportunity". (Benazir Bhutto in US-Congress, 1989)*

The USA slammed sanctions on aid to Pakistan that was available during Afghan war immediately after the end of Soviet occupation in Afghanistan. Pressler amendment was passed by US Senate to block aid to Pakistan that led to hue and cry in Pakistan and media reported Pakistanis feel that they were used against Soviets and now abandoned to face aftermaths like the conflict in Afghanistan, millions of refugees, Arab Jihadi, heroin addiction on streets and Kalashnikov culture (Mahmood, 1994; Senate testimony, 2009). Though, later, during Benazir second government Clinton government brought Brown amendment to ease embargo on Pakistan. But many attempts of the US to convince Pakistan went unsuccessfully to halt its nuclear programme that later culminated in nuclear tests by Pakistan on 28th May 1998. Pakistan and US relations went to their lowest levels during this time of weak civilian governments and it again led to the general perception in Pakistan that US government is not serious to support democracy in Pakistan. After the military coup in October 1999 US Pakistan relations went to lower as the US condemn military takeover in Pakistan (Caldwell, 2011).

Relations in new Millennium

In wake of attack on US soil on 11th September 2001, US launched a long war on terror targeting Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and announced to kill Al-Qaeda's head, Osama bin Laden, as leader of terrorists who attacked the USA in a horrific attack killing 2900 people (Bush, 2009). Afghanistan was to face a second major war in

the new millennium. Taliban government refused to hand over Osama bin Laden and this war started from US forces landed in Northern Afghanistan. US President Bush demanded Pakistan to join NATO efforts against Taliban (Caldwell, 2011). Pakistan was one of three countries which officially recognised Taliban government as the legitimate government in Afghanistan and strategic supporter of Taliban suddenly should take U-turn to support the USA (D'Souza, 2012; Dalrymple, 2013). Strategically this was a major decision and it also created resistance within many circles of Pakistani politics and military as they accused the USA of leaving Pakistan to deal with the mess in Afghanistan after Soviets left Afghanistan in 1988 and not only but the USA also put sanctions on Pakistan due to her legitimate nuclear advances concerning her security.

On May 2, 2011 American SEALs killed Osama bin Laden in a military operation within the city of Abbottabad while Pakistan was not informed about this operation by Americans suspecting a leak that can lead failure to this operation (Rollings, 2011). Pakistan government after operation condemned USA operation and called this an aggression against her sovereignty (Joachim Krause, 2014). Dr Afridi a medical doctor who led to confirmation of Osama bin Laden was arrested and sentenced by Pakistani military court.

On 11th June 2008 in Gora Prai, in data kheel, US lead NATO forces struck inside Pakistani soil and lead to the killing of ten or more of the Pakistani soldiers (Rondeaux, 2008). Similarly, an incident on 26th November 2011 NATO forces killed 28 Pakistani soldiers at two military check posts in Salala led to serious diplomatic strains between two states (Asia, 2011; Saikal, 2014). There was a time when USA used unmanned drone predators to kill many AL Qaeda and Taliban leaders within territory of Pakistan that claimed to be supported by Pakistani officials but has generated serious reactions within people of Pakistan. The reactions halted such frequent strikes by the USA as NATO supplies were blocked by people in many cities.

Pakistan again was offered with good economic and military aid, it also provided air bases initially along with supply root for the US, NATO forces fighting in Afghanistan. Yet this war soon proved a long campaign and now it's still ongoing after seventeen years with no visible signs of settlement.

Pakistan and the US not only have policy disagreements over Afghanis war strategy but also accuse each other mishandling situation, US accuses Pakistan of supporting Haqqani group that is one of active fighting group against the US, while Pakistan accuses the USA of not considering Taliban as legitimate power brokers in Afghanistan but also of ignoring Pakistani security and strategic interest against India (Small, 2015). Further, Tehreek-i-Taliban Pakistan that is bleeding the Pakistani state with terrorist strikes has its leadership enjoying secure hideout in Afghanistan while the USA blames same to Pakistan for providing safe havens to Quetta Shura of Afghan Taliban in Baluchistan. This mistrust is filled with many allegations and counter allegations like residence of Osama bin Laden, Mullah

Mansoor presence inside Pakistan and many others while Pakistan also have concern about many incidents like Remind Davis private contractor that killed Pakistani men in daylight in Lahore, suspected presence of many other Black Water mercenaries within Pakistan, uninformed attacks against Pakistani sovereignty as in 2008 and 2011 (Rashid, 2013).

Further, Pakistan complains about lower economic support to its military and other efforts in the US war in Afghanistan while Pakistan lost seventy to eighty thousand lives in this war against militants, around $118bn in economic losses to her economy for the past seventeen years (Waterman, 2013; Report, 2015; Report, 2016).

Understanding of Misunderstandings

States never pursue interests of other states, as states can be called selfish and self-centered for their survival, security, development, and interests. It is important to understand that both US and Pakistan have their separate interests and these interests must not necessarily be in harmony to lead a good working relationship. However, these relations must serve maximum for each partner in the relationship to conclude healthy and long-term relations. Further, it is important to consider that differences of these interests are due to position and situation of each state where each one has reasons to justify her actions. Realisation towards each other's interest is the only way to make a working harmony. There is need to look at these conflicting versions to develop a greater understanding of these differences on these issues so we could conclude this study in fulfilled manner.

Afghan Factor

As president of the USA, Trump recently warned Pakistan in harsh tone against safe sanctuaries of Haqqani and other Taliban groups within her territory and stated that all options are open for USA to act according to needs to ensure the security of USA in the region. This clearly indicates that US policy makers have the belief that Pakistan is playing a double game by providing safe havens to various groups confronting US forces in Afghanistan (Wetering, 2016). But on another hand, Pakistan looks sticking to her long-standing opinion since 1988 that solution to Afghanistan unrest lies in withdrawal of alien forces including the US and by bringing a broad-based Afghan government including Taliban. If we look at war on terror, its costs and causalities, it is easy to understand that this has become another deadly conflict for the people of Afghanistan who were not responsible for the attacks on twin towers and it costs them a very high price (Haider, 2010). Yet, Pakistan has the serious concern of growing Indian presence in the Afghanistan as it sees such presence, a threat to her security and finds its links with separatist elements within her Baluchistan region.

Critical view of this policy speech regarding Afghanistan part is kind of good news for Pakistani foreign office and military strategists as the USA in leadership of President Trump started talking about inclusion of Taliban sooner or later in the future of the Afghanistan along with realisation towards indigenous form of democracy that very much suits Afghan mind-set, political and cultural values. Further, Mr Trump government finds a need for a strategic adjustment to deal with the unrest and war in Afghanistan, by adopting decentralised command and control along with the use of multiple strategies to handle all situation. All these key points echo Pakistan's long-standing version on dealing Afghan issue in a sustained way. Only matter of concern that making Pakistan and USA feel the pressure of disagreement is regarding Haqqani and other groups which Pakistan is blamed for keeping sheltered on her soil. If Pakistan and USA could find a rapid way to bring Taliban to the negotiation table and to hold a productive ceasefire, both countries can resolve this issue without further damage to trust and mutual relations.

Security Issues and Concerns

Pakistan is security conscious state and will never risk Indian influence under the umbrella of US in Afghanistan and allow safe-haven for her proxy war on Pakistan in Baluchistan. Pakistan fears that it will lead to a sandwich asphyxia for Pakistani security. Similarly, while the USA intends chasing Al-Qaeda and Taliban leadership inside Pakistan. It is triggering the feeling of insecurity in Pakistan as no state could allow another state to operate freely within its border. Use of Drones by Americans also may not be a major concern for Pakistani establishment when it's done with mutual understanding and cooperation but it generates criticism within circles of human rights and international human watch organisation that results in casualty of innocent people (Parmer, Miller, & Ledwidge, 2014).

Pakistan also has serious concerns about the presence of Mullah Fazal Ullah who is head of Tehrek Taliban Pakistan (TTP), an anti-state group in Pakistan, which is perpetrating terrorist activities within Pakistan. TTP and other such elements are finding safe havens in Afghanistan. Even many anti-state Baluch leaders are believed to be hiding in Afghanistan and carrying attacks on Pakistan army from time to time. Pakistan also wants the US on her side while its related Indian proxy inside Baluchistan especially after the capture of Indian spy Kulbhushan Yadav from Baluchistan and his acceptance of Pakistan's charges of spying and supporting separatists activities in Baluchistan (Kakar, 2015).

Further, Pakistan is keen to achieve deterrence against aggressive designs of India by accessing modern military technology and nuclear support from the USA that she thinks is being denied by the USA. Adding fuel to fire, the US mood of pleasing India for the last decade due to her economic weight that suits USA as a big consumer market and buyer of many of US technologies increases the mistrust of Pakistan. On another hand, USA has a view that she is not having any

discriminatory treatment towards Pakistan or any special treatment towards India and the only thing she makes while leading a decision is keeping her best interests. Therefore, US relies on India as an ally against China in the region to safeguard the long term strategic dominance she enjoys. The USA also finds Pakistan's role in providing sanctuaries to Quetta Shura and other anti-US groups which are fighting in Afghanistan as a matter of concern and demands Pakistan to do more against such groups to end their strategic support within Pakistan. Which Pakistan continuously denies and present the case of her sacrifices and compromises on her national interests related Afghanistan and other failures of the international community and the US while dealing Afghanistan issue. Pakistan finds USA responsible for the security issues inside her territory (Bindra, 1988). Pakistan has a version that she wants a permanent solution to these issues in Afghanistan and in Kashmir to make sure that region progress to peaceful and prosperous future. By finding peace and security in Afghanistan essential for their future, both countries converges in terms of their interest in Afghanistan. Such convergence offers space for working relation and partnership between the two states.

Nuclear Proliferation

Pakistan started its nuclear program for energy purposes with help of Canadian government to install country's first nuclear power plant in Karachi under Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission in 1971 named as KANUPP-I with a capacity of 137 MW that over times reduced to 85MW in recent times. Yet, later PAEC established other projects with indigenous efforts and this program found support from China recently (Small, 2015). The country aims to produce 2000MW till 2020 to cover its growing energy crisis that getting sever since past few years. Pakistan also announced later to gain nuclear technology for military and defense purposes by achieving minimum deterrence. Kahuta Research Laboratories (KRL) were established in 1976 for this purpose along with Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission that was also given the same task of uranium enrichment for military purposes. When the USA came to know about Pakistan's intentions of gaining nuclear bomb after Indians tested their weapon, codenamed *Smiling Budha* in 1974, US tried to convince Pakistan to avoid such efforts as this would lead to nuclear arms race in the region which was not in the interest of US and rest of world. Pakistan decided to reject US advice and carry on with its nuclear activities upon this US for the first time in three decades put economic and military sanctions on Pakistan and put an embargo over economic aid to Pakistan (Reiter & Gartner, 2013). The country is continuously looking its inclusion in the nuclear club that under IAEA rule can share its nuclear technology with other countries for energy and other peaceful means to generate revenue from this.

Developments in Afghanistan and Soviet invasion of Afghanistan eased relations and those sanctions were lifted by the USA and it started providing military and

economic aid to Pakistan but continuously kept a stress for avoiding nuclear arm. Pakistan always categorically stated that its nuclear program was for peaceful purposes and denied her capability for having a nuclear bomb. Till mid-eighties Americans got convinced that Pakistan has successfully achieved nuclear capacity, so American now started with a new version of rolling back nuclear program and pressured Pakistan to avoid testing a nuclear bomb (Delpech, 2012).

Once Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan USA put sanctions on Pakistan based on nuclear activities that severely affected Pakistani economy but she went on with her nuclear program and later in 1998 on 28th of May made first nuclear tests to confirm its nuclear capability (Congress, US foreign assistance to Pakistan, 2010). From that point, she holds version that her nuclear program is for minimum deterrence against Indian nuclear adventures. Americans put further sanctions on Pakistan after that but this proved short term this time as the war in Afghanistan once again forced Americans to join hands with Pakistan.

In 2004, Americans claimed to unearth a nuclear proliferation and nuclear smuggling group led by Pakistani nuclear scientist Dr. Abdul Qadeer, later some proof from Libya and couple of other countries were obtained to confirm this was happening (Broad, 2004; Pollack, 2012) Pakistani government of President Musharaff acted and removed Dr. AQ Khan from his position at Kahuta. Further he was made to seek national apology on national television for being involved in this. Pakistan cooperated with the USA and put end to all possible means which were used by the network (Shah S., 2009)

USA still struggles for forcing Pakistan to roll back the nuclear programme and to end nuclear arms race in the Indian sub-continent. In response, Pakistan always puts forward the argument of minimum deterrence with its willingness to sign agreement with Indians or rest of world if India is made first to roll back her nuclear programme. Pakistan considers it unjust to demand only her to go for rolling back its programme unilaterally while India holds on to expand the same (Kux, 2001). Many inside the US has shown concerns over the safety of Pakistani nuclear program yet Pakistani brushes aside their concerns and surprise that no one inside the US talks about Indian nuclear program with the same intensity and it looks unfair to Pakistan. This looks hard nut to crack in future as none of Pakistan and India will ever get ready to roll back their nuclear program from the level of achievements they have made so far.

Economic gains and losses

US government has a view that they provided Pakistan with sufficient military and non-military aid in past sixteen years and in return Pakistan failed to serve US purpose within its own territory. According to congressional record, Pakistan received $ 20bn so far in respect of payments, military and non-military aid for supporting the US led war in Afghanistan and crack down on Al-Qaeda and other

militants (Clarke, 2004) . Since the early days of US war in Afghanistan, Pakistan is being accused of playing a double game.

On another hand, Pakistan denies any safe havens for Taliban groups instead it points to the arrest of hundreds of Al-Qaeda leaderships within its territory and in some cases handed over to Americans after Pakistanis made such arrests. Including Khalid Sheikh Muhammad and other most wanted Al-Qaeda leaders (Gall, 2014).

In recent times Pakistan has started to press the case of damages it has suffered a loss of $118bn due to participation in war on terror (Report A. , 2016). Further, there is realisation in Islamabad that what the US offered to Pakistan for joining war against Al-Qaeda is peanuts in comparison to its losses.

The USA has given Pakistan $20bn from time to time that included $7.5bn under Kerry-Lugar bill since October 2009 to October 2014 as a nonmilitary aid, further Obama government approved $3.1bn to Pakistan in her fight against Al-Qaeda during Obama government (Report, 2009; Kakar, 2015). What Pakistan paid back in this war on terror cannot be weighed in the monetary term as more than hundreds of thousands of civilians and thousands of army personals lost their lives aftermath of Afghan war with its impact on Pakistan for being a front-line state. Socio-psychological impact of this war is far more horrible for the country in coming decades, where all population is on continuous alert and threat while people move into markets and for daily life activities (Trofimov, 2014; Report, 2015).

Indian Factor

More important factor that can bring decisive balance and harmony among relationship of USA and Pakistan is consideration of Indian factor by both sides, as India in recent times start enjoying a good relationship and harmony with the USA due to her economic benefits for the USA (Dalrymple, 2013). This has given India greater freedom inside Afghanistan and such Indian freedom while dealing Afghanistan relations is an alarm for Pakistan who already blames India for major unrests and proxies inside Baluchistan and her support to TTP.

After many terror incidents within India like Mumbai attacks, Pathankot attacks and others inside Kashmir, it was not only India that accused Pakistan of backing such attacks and using groups like Lashkar Taiba, Jesh Muhammad, and Jamat ul Dawa but US policy makers and media was quick to accept Indian version and many of such groups are now added to international terrorist groups list by the USA and UN.

Pakistan also sees growing Indian influence inside Afghanistan, unrest inside Baluchistan, KP province, Karachi, and Kashmir issue as serious matters for her security that is not taken that way by any other international power including her ally the USA. Her quest for countering balance in the region for her security, not only seeks good relations with China but also with the USA. There is a need

for both states to find a win-win situation on this issue as it is a most important aspect in defining relationships between two states. So this factor of India in relations of two states is the easiest one to conclude and resolve in harmony.

Psychological factors

Some researcher in modern times tried to understand international relations using cognitive and behavioral approaches by bringing together politics and psychology and they came with a political-psychological perspective on the issues considering human element of international affairs by comparing states with humans who are keeping certain political mind-set. Political psychology of International Relations is being taught as a subject in many universities along with psychology as a tool to understand international relations in a better way while making a study. Rebecca M. Miller (2014) in her article mentioned similar factors with reference to Russia. Similarly the study by Kenneth Yalowitz and Matthew Rojansky of Russian international relations, focuses on the need and importance of the use of psychological analysis of International relations. Keeping historical and descriptive aspect here we will note certain aspects of political psychology while we consider Pak-US relations as discussed above.

While USA sees Pakistan as an all-time beneficiary from the relationship of two states, Pakistan suffers from the feeling of abandonment. Pakistan's point of view has been accepted by the former secretary of state Hillary Clinton in her testimony before congress when she explained how Pakistanis see their relations with the US since times of Afghan war in the 1980s. As US looks Pakistani nuclear advances as easy to get into wrong hands and wants Pakistan to halt this, but Pakistan thinks it's nuclear gains necessary for her defense against Indian nuclear developments in the region.

There is a need for good and practical realization from both sides while handling mutual relations that the US as major power mostly focuses on current relationship, while Pakistan carrying considerations from past experiences and looks to secure her future due to many uncertainties and pressures.

Conclusion

Like other states in our world both Pakistan and USA has priorities to secure their national interests. Both have their own way of protecting their interest in short, medium or long terms. Yet the differences of capacity, strength of power and economic conditions make each state act accordingly as US while afford to go with a policy that focuses on current events instead considering past or future while deciding relationship with medium power like Pakistan, while on contrary grounds Pakistan is weary of past betrayals from US and her future needs based on regional security issues. As accommodation of Pakistani fears concerns related India and

her bitter experience in settling Afghan issue on permanent terms are important for Pakistani diplomats. Similarly, the US diplomats will look for encouraging signs of being on the same page with Pakistan when Pakistan abolishes the safe sanctuaries within her territory. Most of such actions in real terms can only be realized after Taliban are made part of Afghan government as that will give Pakistan the requisite satisfaction that Kabul is not being used against her by Indians. Pakistan also requires inclusion into nuclear group. However, Pakistan needs to understand the US convers about rapid proliferation (even legal) to earn easy money to strengthen its weak economy. Pakistan's weak economy would compel her to monetise this inclusion. Economic securities and support may be the best way for the USA and the world to make sure that Pakistan will not only be the happy state to do what world wants it for more but also will make Pakistan be more attentive towards world and US to keep its economic and developmental gains intact. Considering many works within Pakistan related to Pakistan-US relations like one by Ayub Khan and political mood in Islamabad that is hawking for dignified status on the world stage, may require the USA, her think tanks, especially the architects of foreign policy in Washington to seriously consider relationship with Pakistan as win-win situation. Every time the US needs to bring new normalization of relations between two nations especially strategic and military needs whether it was Baghdad pact, Afghan war of the 80s or war on terror. In this regard Pakistan, as medium military power and weak economic power can do little to correct the things, she can keep crying its version related to sustained settlement of Afghanistan issues as she is doing since 1988 or about more economic aid that she demands every time while it's about relations between two states. Another option for her goes with her sole-defined objective to keep waiting until the US again need her military support and this looks inevitable in future like the past, due to Pakistan's strategic location that neighboring her to Arabian Gulf, Indian subcontinent and China. Pakistan cannot be treated with the consideration of Afghanistan issue on international level. On the contrary it must be otherwise as Pakistan is comparatively more important country at work stage than Afghanistan and she deserves her due place in regional affairs not as part of any bargain due to its influence over Taliban and others inside Afghanistan due to Pashtun links but for her comparative existence considering Afghanistan. The USA requires to reassess its strategy regarding Pakistan and change her approach of only focusing short terms while having relations with Pakistan due to the strategic importance Pakistan enjoys. With nuclear assets Pakistan must be treated as a medium power in the region. It not only about dealing with misunderstandings by dealing with the leading understandings and realization of mutual concerns but it also about peace, security and future of every sixth human being on earth who lives in this region or maybe its impacts can go far beyond to the whole world.

References

Allison, R. (1988). *The Soviet Union and the Strategy of Non-Alignment in the Third World.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, .

Anders Wivel, H. M. (2005). *The Geopolitics of Euro-Atlantic Integration.* New York: Routledge.

Asia, B. (2011). *Pakistan outrage after 'Nato attack kills soldiers'*. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-15901363

Benjamin de Carvalho, I. B. (2014). *Small State Status Seeking: Norway's Quest for International Standing.* Oxon: Routledge, .

Berman, I. (2017). *President Trump puts Pakistan on notice in Afghanistan speech*. Retrieved September 3, 2017, from https://www.usatoday.com/story /opinion/2017/08/23/president-trump-puts-pakistan-notice-afghanistan-speech/588329001/

Bindra, S. S. (1988). *Determinants of Pakistan's Foreign Policy.* New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications,.

Bush, G. W. (2009). *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism.* New York: Morgan James Publishing,.

Caldwell, D. (2011). *Vortex of Conflict: U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq.* Stanford: Stanford University Press,.

Callard, K. B. (1959). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Interpretation.* Michigan: Institute of Pacific Relations,.

Campbell Craig, F. L. (2012). *America's Cold War.* London: Harvard University Press.

Clarke, R. A. (2004). *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror.* New York: Simon and Schuster,.

Collins, A. (2013). *Contemporary Security Studies.* Oxford: OUP Oxford, .

Commonwealth Advisory Group for Updating the 1985 Vulnerability Report, M. E. (1997). *A Future for Small States: Overcoming Vulnerability*. London : Commonwealth Secretariat,.

Congress, U. S. (1982). *Congress and Foreign Policy, Volumes 1981-1987.* Madison: U.S. Government Printing Office, .

Congress, U. S. (2010). *US foreign assistance to Pakistan.* Pennsylvania : U.S. G.P.O.,.

Cover, F. (2003). *Democracies and Small Wars.* London: Routledge,.

C-SPAN.org. (1989). *Video*. Retrieved August 30, 2017, from https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4602610/benazir-bhutto-address-us-conress-1989

Dalrymple, W. (2013). *A Deadly Triangle: Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India.* Washington: Brookings Institution Press,.

Daron Acemoglu, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty.* Clays, UK: Profile Books.

David Kinsella, B. R. (2012). *World Politics: The Menu for Choice* (10th ed.). London : WADSWORTH CENGAG Learing .

Delpech, T. (2012). *Nuclear Deterrence in the 21st Century: Lessons from the Cold War for a New Era of Strategic Piracy.* Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, .

Dimitrakis, P. (2012). *Failed Alliances of the Cold War: Britain's Strategy and Ambitions in Asia and the Middle East.* New York: I.B.Tauris,.

Downs, G. W. (1994). *Collective Security Beyond the Cold War.* Michigan : University of Michigan Press,.

D'Souza, S. M. (2012). *US-Pakistan Relations and the 'end-game' in Afghanistan.* Singapore: Institute of South Asian Studies, National University of Singapore.

Dutt, B. (2017). *Trump gets it right on Afghanistan and Pakistan*. Retrieved September 3, 2017, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/global-opinions/wp/2017/08/24/trump-gets-it-right-on-afghanistan-and-pakistan/?utm_term=.da7e7b394e79

Erich Reiter, H. G. (2013). *Small States and Alliances.* Vienna: Springer Science & Business Media,.

Evangelista, M. (2008). *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror.* Cambridge : Polity,.

Francis Gary Powers, C. G. (2001). *Operation Overflight: A Memoir of the U-2 Incident.* Lincoln: Potomac Books, .

Fukuyama, F. (2006). *End of History and the Last Man.* New York: Simon and Schuster,.

Gall, C. (2014). *The Wrong Enemy: America in Afghanistan, 2001–2014.* Geneva,: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt,.

Gaur, M. (2005). *Foreign Policy Annual, 2001-2009: Events.* Dehli: Gyan Publishing House, .

Guzzini, S. (2013). *Power, Realism and Constructivism.* Oxon : Routledge.

Haider, Z. (2010). *The Ideological Struggle for Pakistan.* Stanford : Hoover Press,.

Hubbard, J. P. (2010). *The United States and the End of British Colonial Rule in Africa, 1941–1968.* Jefferson: McFarland,.

Hussain, A. (1966). *Pakistan: its ideology and foreign policy.* California: Cass.

Inderjeet Parmar, L. B. (2014). *Obama and the World: New Directions in US Foreign Policy.* Oxon: Routledge,.

Inderjeet Parmar, M. C. (2010). *Soft Power and US Foreign Policy: Theoretical, Historical and Contemporary Perspectives.* Oxon: Routledge,.

Iver B. Neumann, O. W. (2005). *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Jehoon Park, T. J. (2011). *Regionalism, Economic Integration and Security in Asia: A Political Economy Approach.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing,.

Joachim Krause, C. K. (2014). *Afghanistan, Pakistan and Strategic Change: Adjusting Western Regional Policy.* Oxon: Routledge,.

John Spanier, J. N. (2013). *Congress, the Presidency and American Foreign Policy: Pergamon Policy Studies on International Politics.* New York: Elsevier,.

Johnston, D. M. (2011). *Religion, Terror, and Error: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Challenge of Spiritual Engagement.* Santa Barbara : ABC-CLIO.

Joshua Pollack, G. P. (2012). *The A.Q. Khan Network and its Fourth Customer*. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/01/23/a.q.-khan-network-and-its-fourth-customer-event-3505

Kakar, A. (2015). *The Us-Afghanistan Relations During Obama Era: Implications for Pakistan.* Munich: GRIN Verlag,.

Khan, R. M. (2013). *Afghanistan and Pakistan: Conflict, Extremism, and Resistance to Modernity.* Baltimore,: JohnHopkins University Press.

Kux, D. (2001). *The United States and Pakistan, 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies.* Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press,.

Lisa Harrison, T. C. (2013). *Key Research Concepts in Politics and International Relations.* London : SAGE.

Litwak, R. (2000). *Rogue States and U.S. Foreign Policy: Containment After the Cold War.* Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, .

Mahmood, T. (1994). Pressler Amendment and Pakistan's Security Concerns . *Pakistan Horizon*, 97-107.

Malik, H. (2016). *Soviet-Pakistan Relations and Post-Soviet Dynamics, 1947–92.* London: Springer,.

Markey, D. S. (2014). *Reorienting U.S. Pakistan Strategy: From Af-Pak to Asia.* Council on Foreign Relations,. New York: Council on Foreign Relations,.

McGarr, P. M. (2013). *The Cold War in South Asia: Britain, the United States and the Indian Subcontinent, 1945–1965.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press,.

McMahon, R. J. (2010). *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India, and Pakistan.* New York: Columbia University Press,.

McMahon, R. J. (2013). *The Cold War in the Third World.* Oxford: OUP USA,.

Michael K. Connors, R. D. (2005). *The New Global Politics of the Asia Pacific.* New York: Routledge, .

Michta, A. A. (2006). *The Limits of Alliance: The United States, NATO, and the EU in North and Central Europe.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers,.

Miller, R. M. (2014, December 17). *feature*. Retrieved September 11, 2017, from www.nationalinterest.org: http://nationalinterest.org/feature/time-make-psychology-part-international-relations-11872

Murphy, C. (2007). *Are We Rome?: The Fall of an Empire and the Fate of America.* New York: Houghton Mifflin .

Myers, R. H. (1982). *A U.S. foreign policy for Asia: the 1980s and beyond.* Michigan: Hoover Institution Press,.

Nikolas K. Gvosdev, C. M. (2013). *Russian Foreign Policy: Interests, Vectors, and Sectors.* London: CQ Press,.

Office, U. S. (1975). *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Richard Nixon, 1973: Containing the Public Messages, Statements, and Speeches of the President.* Washington: Government Printing Office,.

Pedersen, C. (2008). Cosmopolitanism or nativism?: US national identity and foreign policy in the twenty first century . In K. T. Christie (Ed.), *United States Foreign Policy and National Identity in the 21st Century* (pp. 20-34). Oxon: Routledge.

Peter L. Bergen, D. R. (2014). *Drone Wars.* New York: Cambridge University Press,.

Philip J. Adler, R. L. (2012). *World Civilizations: Volume II: Since 1500.* Boston: Cengage Learning.

R. Nicholas Burns, J. P. (2009). *The Global Economic Crisis and Potential Implications for Foreign Policy and National Security.* Washington DC: Aspen Institute,.

Rashid, A. (2013). *Pakistan on the Brink: The Future of Pakistan, Afghanistan and the West.* London: Penguin, .

Report, A. (2016). *War on terror' has cost Pakistan $118bn: SBP*. Retrieved August 30, 2017, from https://www.dawn.com/news/1297305

Report, N. (2009). *Obama Signs $7 Billion Aid Bill for Pakistan*. Retrieved September 4, 2017, from http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/10/15/obama-signs-billion-aid-pakistan.html

Report, W. D. (2015). *80,000 Pakistanis killed in US 'War on Terror': report*. Retrieved August 31, 2017, from https://tribune.com.pk/story/860790/80000-pakistanis-killed-in-us-war-on-terror-report/

Richard Lee Armitage, S. R. (2010). *U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations,.

Rizvi, H. (1993). *Pakistan and the Geostrategic Environment: A Study of Foreign Policy* (Vol. 1). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Roger E. Kasperson, J. V. (2011). *The Structure of Political Geography.* New Burnswick : Transaction Publishers,.

Rollings, J. (2011). *Osama bin Laden's Death: Implications and Considerations.* Washington: DIANE Publishing.

Rondeaux, C. (2008). *U.S. Military Releases Video Footage of Airstrike in Pakistan.* Washington Post Foreign Service. Washington : Washington Post .

Saikal, A. (2014). *Zone of Crisis: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and Iran.* London: I.B.Tauris.

Shah, M. A. (2017). *More than 80 people died in a Pakistan terror attack last night – where exactly is the hashtag and the solidarity?* Retrieved August 31, 2017, from http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/isis-terrorism-pakistan-donald-trump-media-press-a7585461.html

Shah, S. (2009). *Pakistan releases 'father' of nuclear bomb from house arrest* . Retrieved September 10, 2017 , from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/feb/06/nuclear-pakistan-khan

Small, A. (2015). *The China-Pakistan Axis: Asia's New Geopolitics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, .

Society, A. P. (1895). *World Affairs,* (Vols. Volumes 57-58). Boston: American Peace Society.

Szirmai, A. (2005). *The Dynamics of Socio-Economic Development: An Introduction.* Cape Toen: Cambridge University Press,.

Thomas G. Paterson. (1989). *Kennedy's Quest for Victory: American Foreign Policy, 1961-1963.* Oxford : Oxford University Press,.

Times, T. N. (2017). *Full Transcript and Video: Trump's Speech on Afghanistan*. Retrieved August 30, 2017, from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/21/world/asia/trump-speech-afghanistan.html

Trofimov, Y. (2014). *In Its Own War on Terror, Pakistan Piles Up Heavy Losses*. Retrieved September 4, 2017, from https://www.wsj.com/articles/in-its-own-war-on-terror-pakistan-piles-up-heavy-losses-1394504943

Waterman, S. (2013). *Heavy price: Pakistan says war on terror has cost nearly 50,000 lives there since 9/11* . Retrieved August 31, 2017, from http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/mar/27/heavy-price-pakistan-says-war-terror-has-cost-near/

Weitsman, P. A. (2014). *Waging War: Alliances, Coalitions, and Institutions of Interstate Violence.* Stanford: Stanford University Press,.

West, B. A. (2010). *Encyclopedia of the Peoples of Asia and Oceania.* New York: Infobase Publishing,.

Wetering, C. v. (2016). *Changing US Foreign Policy toward India: US-India Relations since the Cold War*. New York: Springer, .

William J. Broad, D. E. (2004). *A Tale of Nuclear Proliferation: How Pakistani Built His Network*. Retrieved August 30, 2017, from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/02/12/world/a-tale-of-nuclear-proliferation-how-pakistani-built-his-network.html