

Drivers of Anti-Americanism in Pakistan

*Musarat Amin and Rizwan Naseer **

Abstract: This paper pinpoints the narrative that Pakistani masses and policy makers have developed because of the flawed policies of the United States (US) towards Pakistan and also highlights deep-rooted mistrust that impedes cooperation even on strategic issues. US policies remained unpopular in Pakistan as ruling junta always blamed the former to manipulate this situation in her favour. This could not bring two nations and their leaders closer as the strategic cooperation between both countries is sine qua non to bring peace and stability in Afghanistan and normalize relations with India. This paper underscores the historical participation of Pakistan to US-sponsored security pacts (SEATO and CENTO) and Pakistan's expectations from the US as a result. Anti-Americanism in Pakistan has equally hurt Pakistan's strategic, economic and political interests in the region as well at global level. International community has been declaring Pakistan a fragile state and more prone to failure because of US annoyance. There are few questions that radical anti-Americans need to ponder over that why does the US need relationship with Pakistan and what strategic benefits can Pakistan offer to the US in contemporary times? This paper suggests that hating America and blaming her will not generate any solution to policy problems, but to reinvigorate Pakistan's diplomacy, empower state institutions and vibrant strategy of counter-terrorism.

Keywords: Anti-Americanism, Diplomacy, Counterterrorism, Relationship, Mistrust.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The major problem that the US faces in the execution of its foreign policy in Pakistan is the anti-Americanism sentiment.¹ US policies despite benignity do not enjoy support by masses in Pakistan. Popularly known Keohane and Katzenstein, distinguish between various types of anti-American sentiments, but the most notable among them are the Liberal Anti-Americanism and Radical Anti-Americanism.² Liberal Anti-Americanism is common among postmodern democracies that share common values of "the American creed". Despite being the allies of the US, those liberal democracies overtly criticize Uncle Sam for not adhering to values of American creed. On the contrary, Radical Anti-Americanism is abhorrent sentiments for American liberal values; people who are Radical Anti-

* Dr Musarat Amin is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Defence and Diplomatic Studies, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi and Dr Rizwan Naseer is an Assistant Professor of International Relations at the Department of Humanities, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Islamabad.

Americans believe that the US is a source of all evils and its ruination would end up the problems in the world.³

Anti-Americanism in Pakistan can be categorized into violent anti-Americanism and non-violent anti-Americanism. Violent anti-Americanism is quite visible among illiterate or less educated class, while non-violent anti-Americanism is seeable among educated class.⁴ Most of the Islamic states also experience Radical Anti-Americanism because of the US unpopular policies of Unilateralism.⁵ This paper deals with narratives of anti-Americanism in Pakistan. Narrative of anti-Americanism is still built upon US policies during the cold war, post-cold war and post-9/11 era. Neither US nor Pakistani government has ever made serious attempts to change this narrative, which is fallaciously built. US flawed policies towards South Asia have contributed towards impeding US interests rather achieving them. Based on this narrative, which is a determining factor in achieving common strategic and socio-economic goals, both countries failed to evolve mutual trust. If this narrative of anti-Americanism is altered, then Pakistan-US strategic relationship would have massive potential to fix the ailments of Afghanistan and Pakistan, even South Asia would experience more stability. Achieving cooperation with Pakistan on the war against terrorism, stability of South Asia requires acknowledgement of Pakistan's unrelenting efforts. Coercive diplomacy to deal with Pakistan would rather deteriorate mutual relations.

History Matters in Case of Pakistan

The commonly built narrative and which goes viral among Pakistani masses is that Pakistan has been under constant threat from Indian aggression since 1947, which ultimately disintegrated East-Pakistan in 1971. On the other side, the US remained tilted towards India despite Indian neutralist posture during early phase of the cold war. The US first extended invitation to Indian Prime Minister Nehru to pay official visit to the US. Truman's administration wondered that how the policy of containment in South Asia was possible without inclusion of India, whereas, Sir William Barton and Sir Olaf Caroe argue that Pakistan and not India was the key to West Asian defence.⁶ To send very friendly gesture to the US, Pakistan also extended candid support to the *San Francisco Peace Treaty* with Japan and out rightly supported the United Nations by condemning North Korean aggression.⁷

The striking question that pops in the minds of majority of Pakistanis that why did the US choose Pakistan as an ally during the cold war era? Well, the US had grand designs of containing communism, John Foster Dulles an architect of massive retaliation unriddled that Pakistan and other "Northern Tier States" (Turkey, Iran and Iraq) could effectively foster US security in Asia, therefore, Pentagon hastily endorsed Dulles' plan of regional defence without casting any doubts. Eisenhower

administration agreed to arm and equip five and half divisions of the Pakistan Army with a total cost of US \$ 500 million from 1956 through December, 1959.⁸ Eisenhower was increasingly worried about his decision and lamented in a Nation Security Council meeting in 1957 by saying “terrible error” of investment on such a weak ally.⁹ But, Pakistani policymakers seldom acknowledge this huge contribution of the US to equip Pakistan’s armed forces during crucial times of the cold war. Pakistan’s security was not sufficiently strong without US military aid during that time. Leicester Webb argues that though these pacts (SEATO, CENTO) were beneficial for Pakistan in terms of military and economic aid, but “Pakistan made it embarrassingly plain that she was doing so primarily to strengthen her position against India”¹⁰ as Pakistan’s greatest fear was Indian aggression.

Markey’s *No Exit from Pakistan: America’s Troubled Relationship with Islamabad* brings out that the problem with Pakistan-US relations is that both sides failed to value mutual relationship. The US used Pakistan as pawn in broader geopolitical chess game, which included the containment of communism, opening secret talks with Beijing and arming Mujahedeen in Afghanistan.¹¹ He also categorizes anti-Americanism in Pakistan as Liberal Anti-Americanism, Nationalist Anti-Americanism and Violent Anti-Americanism.¹² To him, Liberal Anti-Americanism in Pakistan is based on baffled feeling of those educated people, who see the US positively, but agitate, when the US extends support to military dictators in Pakistan. Nationalist Anti-American strand is based on the feelings that the US breached promises and remained a *fair-weather-friend*, whereas, Violent Anti-Americanism is ingrained among Jihadist forces, who aspire of seizing control of the area.¹³ These radicals plot attacks against the US, because they perceive US as a threat to their norms, values, religion and culture. By exercising soft power of economic aid and diplomatic manoeuvres, the US has waged multiple attempts to reduce radical anti-Americanism, but these efforts majorly went unaccomplished.

Bruce Reidel in his *What We Won: America’s Secret War in Afghanistan 1979-89* pens that “it was a conflict between democracy and communism that shaped the history of millions of people across the globe, and the modern US national security institutions like the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency was fashioned to fight it”.¹⁴ The cold war has been the greatest threat to the US-led system and ideology. Whereas, in practice, no ally of the US directly got into war as Pakistan did. Washington was quite aware that Pakistan became signatory of US-sponsored Security Pacts not to combat communism, but to aggrandize its own security arrangements by obtaining military, economic and diplomatic support from the US and its European allies.

Pakistan as a Pawn in Afghanistan-Soviet War (1979-89)

Pakistanis express their grievances towards the US that Pakistan was ensnared into Afghan-Soviet war and the latter paid a huge price for alliance with the US. Afghan-Soviet war was designed to stop Soviet expansion towards other strategically significant countries of Middle East. Pakistan was urged by the US to join the war. Pakistan's sacrifices, as a consequence of war, were not extolled at international forums. Pakistan did not get any strategic or security gains from the war, but multiple futuristic security challenges. Influx of Afghan refugees, who came and settled in Pakistan and did not go back, on average every month about 44,118 refugees fled Pakistan to seek shelter.¹⁵ Other agencies of international development (UNHCR, ILO, ICRC, WFP, WHO and UNICEF) assisted in this regard, but major burden was borne by Pakistan alone.¹⁶ Drug trade by smugglers devastated 8.6 millions of Pakistani youth.¹⁷ The US accepted the demand of local groups, i.e., drug trafficking.¹⁸ Wave of extremism in Pakistan, assassinations, bomb blasts, attack on mosques, a brutal and bloody war between Sunni-Shia groups and other off-shoots divided the nation and enervated the nationalism among Pakistanis.

The US backed Afghan war against red troops, otherwise Afghanistan was not in a position to even give a tough time to well-equipped Soviet forces. Whatever was planned for Soviets, later on ravaged Pakistan and Afghanistan. CIA trained 12,500 foreigners (1985-1992) in urban guerrilla warfare, sabotage and bomb making. Later, these rebels used the same techniques of terror against Pakistan. Another blunder that the US made was disbursement of aid (military and economic) to least effective fighter groups.¹⁹ These groups later turned against the US and eventually plotted and executed terrorist attacks against both the nations creating a Frankenstein's monster like situation. These are the primary challenges that Pakistan faced as a result of Afghan-Soviet war.

US Afghan policy went awry as Washington's sneaky exit from Afghanistan without reconstruction and rehabilitation of devastated areas did great damage to regional peace as it left a power vacuum for local warlords to gain grounds in Afghanistan. Prolonged civil war in Afghanistan also affected Pakistan's peace. Pakistan's efforts to stabilize Afghanistan were termed as interference into internal affairs of Afghanistan. That perception still persists in the minds of Afghan youth and Pakistan-Afghanistan relations are still not much smooth as they ought to be. There is a strongly built narrative in Pakistan that no Pakistani or pro-Pakistani can oppose Pakistan's nuclear weapons, because Pakistan's nuclear weapons are aimed at India and India is an arch rival of Pakistan. Washington's imposition of sanctions against Islamabad's nuclear program infuriated Pakistan's government and people alike. Washington was fearful of Pakistan's F-16 jets as potential vehicle for the

delivery of nuclear weapons against India, therefore, decision of delivering F-16 jets was regressed. The US invoked Pressler Amendment to deter Pakistan from going nuclear. Pakistani masses cite this US perfidy to underscore that the US proved an unfaithful partner.

C. Christine Fair in her article published in *Foreign Policy* magazine also admitted that “of course, Pakistan’s complaints are not entirely unfounded: the US did abandon the region once the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan in 1989 and delivered US \$ 5.6 billion aid, of which US \$ 3.5 billion was military assistance.”²⁰ Whereas, Pakistan was a frontline state through Afghanistan war and whatever cache of military aid Pakistan received, was utilized in Afghanistan. Being US ally, Pakistan antagonized Soviet Union and received threats as a consequence of U-2 incident and had never friendly ties with the USSR; it also played critical role in Sino-US rapprochement. Compared to India, Pakistan’s contribution in the cold war was never acknowledged overtly that frustrates Pakistan.

Organized Hypocrisy?

There is an intriguing variable of anti-Americanism among common Pakistanis particularly the uneducated class, who even do not know where the US is situated, but hate America. They hold the US responsible for every *actus reus* in Pakistan even the matters of poor governance, resurgence of terrorists and bad debts are associated to US policies, which they believe are aimed at enfeebling Islamic states in general and Pakistan in particular. On the other hand, Pakistani politicians find it convenient to criminate the US than confessing their own flaws and venal aspirations to stick to power. Anti-American politicians gain momentous popularity and wield the same tool in their election campaign. From Z.A Bhutto to Imran Khan, all democratic leaders used anti-Americanism as a tool to curry public favor and blamed America for supporting dictators and derailing democracy in Pakistan. Stephen D. Krasner defines ‘organized hypocrisy’ as the frequent violation of longstanding norms in international politics.²¹ A large number of educated Pakistanis believe that Pakistan could not catch up other developing countries, because of the elongated dictatorial regimes. Unfortunately, the truth is that despite making wars for promotion of democracy, the US also backed dictatorship where it got a convenience of her foreign policy. Ayub Khan trode on fledgling democracy of Pakistan by introducing the Elected Bodies Disqualification Order (EBDO), which charged politicians under security and martial law regulations. This highly authoritarian order barred politicians from waging their struggle for democracy. But, US President Johnson congratulated Ayub Khan for rapid economic progress, whereas, Robert S. McNamara (former US Secretary of Defense) went further by

saying that “it is one of the greatest successes in development in the world”.²² The US extolled Ayub’s reforms, but no condemnation came against a dictatorial tyranny.

Nixon administration became a major supporter of General Yahya, who proclaimed 1969 martial law in Pakistan. Zia overthrew democratically elected Prime Minister Z.A. Bhutto and seized power in 1977. General Zia introduced Islamic Law in the country by systematically dismantling civil society.²³ The US rather condemning it supported Zia’s doctrine, because the US had its own vested interests to support him against Soviet troops in Afghanistan. After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, military and economic aid dramatically increased towards Pakistan. Soviet invasion in Afghanistan did not pose any significant security threat to Pakistan as Pakistan was signatory of SEATO and CENTO, therefore, it was obligatory for the US to come for Pakistan’s assistance. But, Washington played smarter by promoting slogan of *Jihad* against atheists (Soviet Union). Pakistan was ensnared to become part of this war. As a result of Afghan war, Pakistan also had to shoulder the heavy burden of refugees, who were about 8 million.²⁴

At the beginning of Carter’s administration (1977), Pakistan’s significance on US policy horizon loomed fairly small, because the US had levelled substantially good ties with Saudi Arabia and Iran. The US was also trying to negotiate with Soviet Union directly and Sino-US rapprochement underrated Pakistan’s importance for Washington. Only the geographical location of Pakistan was of some importance.²⁵ Though a SEATO, CENTO ally, but when it came to religious desecration, Pakistan’s masses even attacked US embassy. Former CIA official, Bruce Reidel pinpoints that on November 21, 1979 US embassies in several countries were severely attacked, however, the worst incident occurred in Islamabad, when student demonstrators from nearby Quaid-i-Azam University stormed into US embassy, ransacked and stoke fire. Ambassador Hummel kept asking for help from Pakistani authorities, but of no use. Consequently, one Marine guard was killed and 137 employees of the embassy barricaded themselves in a secure vault to avoid hostage taking.²⁶ The point is that there are also widespread anti-Indian sentiments among Pakistanis, but no such attack has happened on Indian embassy in Islamabad. Such an act was an overt violation of the Vienna Convention (1961) on diplomatic relations and these rules are almost universally adopted as 179 states are party to it.²⁷ Legally, the US could shut down its diplomatic mission in Pakistan. Despite US restraint diplomacy such violent anti-Americanism in Pakistan did not dwindle away even in the years to come.²⁸

Opposing Pakistan’s Nuclear Assets

The US has thoroughly been concerned about proliferation of nuclear weapons to other developing and underdeveloped states. Lewis Dunn argues “a proliferated

world is likely to be nasty and dangerous place, entailing threats to the security and domestic well-being of virtually all nations and posing a serious possibility of long-term decay of global political order.”²⁹ But, the matter of security becomes more serious for a nation, when its neighbour tests a nuclear weapon and gets insuperable strategic advantage and may have an option to bully it whenever needed. Pakistan’s security came under serious threat again, when India tested first nuclear weapon “Smiling Buddha” on May, 1974. To counterpoise Indian nuclear superiority was pretty rational, logical and strategically sufficient for Pakistan to develop nuclear weapons. Pakistan being an ally of US-sponsored security pacts and was not anticipating that the US would treat Pakistan like a threatening state. By invoking the *Nuclear Non-proliferation Act* of 1977 and the *Glenn and Symington Amendments* were used to deter Pakistan from going nuclear.

The Glenn Amendment (1978) terminated aid to Pakistan and even French-aided project to assist nuclear arsenal was also terminated, but the Symington Amendment dealt with enrichment and was even more restrictive than Glenn.³⁰ After dismemberment of East-Pakistan, military establishment was mindful of the security threats, therefore, acquisition of nuclear bomb was attached to national integrity of Pakistan. Any opposition to Pakistan’s nukes met with stringent reaction from the government and masses. US sanction on Pakistan intensified anti-American feeling among civil and military establishment.³¹ Pakistan had acquired atomic bomb during 1980s according to Dr. A.Q. Khan and was ready for tests, but Pakistan was waiting for ripe time to declare as nuclear power state. US sanctions on Pakistan did not work because of the popular public support for the bomb and passionate politics of Z.A. Bhutto.³² Imposition of sanctions on Pakistan was perceived as blocking Pakistan’s nuclear program. No matter how many times Washington clarifies of protecting NPT regime, but US sanctions were termed as contravention to Pakistan’s national interest.

Extremist and Terrorist Outfits

Zia’s doctrine was devastating for Pakistan, even in 2016; Pakistan is facing serious security threats from Taliban and other extremist and terrorist organizations, which established sanctuaries in Pakistan during his era. Because of the exceedingly porous border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, drug trade, narco-trafficking, Kalashnikov culture, religious seminaries and sectarianism came to Pakistan with Jihadist culture. Zia’s prolonged dictatorship perished in a plane crash along with US ambassador Arnold Raphel and core supporters of his regime in August 1988. President Reagan expressed his deep sorrow and eulogized the dictator as “a statesman of world stature” and praising his “dedication to regional peace and reconstruction.”³³ After Zia, Pakistan returned to frail democracy, but democracy

could not work long. General Pervez Musharraf, once again came into power by imposing Martial Law in the country.

US ties have mostly been predicated on personal ties with Pakistani rulers and totally neglected public opinion. After tragic event of 9/11, the US was desperately determined to launch war against terrorism in Afghanistan and there was public outrage against this planned offensive. There were nationwide protests, masses were furious over US decision to initiate a war in Afghanistan with complete backing of Pakistan. Washington counted on Musharraf's assurance and ignored simmering public outrage. Most of the Pakistanis believed that the US was reinforcing Musharraf opposed to the aspirations of the common people, who wanted to restore civilian government, that's why Musharraf's rule sustained crisis. Backing of Musharraf regime was so irksome for the US as it flared widespread anti-American sentiments among people. They clearly opposed military operation in FATA under US pressures,³⁴ because they viewed it as an overt violation of Pakistan's sovereignty.

Pakistanis always termed Musharraf as a strong military dictator, who wrested power from democratically elected regime, but the statement of US outgoing Ambassador to Pakistan, Ryan C. Crocker that "although Musharraf was an army officer but he was not a dictator," was a conspicuous paradox of US commitment to promote democracy. Such duplicity outrages Pakistani masses towards the US. Importantly, failure of US military operation in the wake of war against terror in Afghanistan and Pakistan can be attributed to anti-American sentiments among people as they were not supporting this war, US strategy failed to evolve national consensus in Pakistan. NATO supplies from Pakistan to Afghanistan were attacked, ransacked and disrupted multiple times, which clearly reflected violent anti-Americanism among locals in Baluchistan, FATA, KP, Punjab and Sindh.³⁵

George Bush's Preemptive Doctrine and Repercussions

Fareed Zakaria in his article *Hating America* argues that the US faces identical levels of anti-Americanism in India, Pakistan and Turkey, because none of these are rich, pacifist and postmodern. On the contrary, Israel and Britain are exceptionally pro-American.³⁶ Whereas, anti-Americanism is largely based on the feelings that the US interferes into Pakistan's internal affairs and majority of the uneducated or less educated population thinks that the US wants to westernize Pakistani society through electronic media. Musharraf was bashed by religious scholars for his "Enlightened Moderation". Zakaria holds President George W. Bush's hawkish policies responsible for waves of intense anti-Americanism. While citing the case of Indonesia that is more liberal and progressive Muslim state, he says that in the year 2000 about 75 percent of Indonesians populace was pro-American and after Bush more than 80 percent are hostile to Uncle Sam.³⁷ This brings out that Bush doctrine

earned him and the US ill-fame and distorted US image particularly among Islamic countries because of his unnecessary war as propounded by John J. Mearsheimer.³⁸

John Maszka in his *Terrorism and Bush Doctrine*, outlines catastrophic and consequential policy of President Bush to combat terrorism. Bush doctrine was based on unilateralism, preemption and military hegemony. His overt declaration of preemptive doctrine that “We cannot let our enemies strike first...we’ll not hesitate to act alone...we must build and maintain our defence beyond given challenges”, perturbed Muslim states. International relations scholars highly criticized Bush doctrine of preemption and declared it as catastrophic and counterproductive. Wilhelmsen and Flikke (2005) wrote that if the US can justify its policy of unilateralism and preemption then why can’t other nations do that? He goes on to say that suppose if India justifies its policy of nuclear doctrine against Pakistan, then similar scenario can be imagined on the part of Pakistan as well.³⁹ Though, not very strong, but there exists a fragile bond of Muslim brotherhood among Muslim states and Pakistan’s public expresses its solidarity with the people of Palestine, Syria, Libya, Iraq and Afghanistan. The government of Pakistan disowns Israel as a nation-state in the world by expressing its support for Palestinian cause by writing on the passports of every Pakistani “this passport is valid for all countries of the world except Israel”.⁴⁰ There have been public protests in Islamic countries condemning US combative policies in these countries. Bush and US scholars labelled Iran, Iraq and Libya as rogue states, therefore, invasion of Afghanistan followed by Iraq and then Libya and Syria made people of Pakistan feel that only Muslim states are the target of US military wrath.

Markey traces deep-rooted anti-Americanism among Pakistanis that even for internal governance problems whether they are suicide bombings, corruption and electricity blackouts, the US takes the share of the blame. That is the reason US policies even benign (economic aid, soft loans) are not well received in Pakistan and causes hiccups in Pakistan-US relations. Pakistanis feel that the US might have attached strings of demands to economic aid and loans. If an alliance endures or dissolves then there are certain reasons behind. Stephen M. Walt pens that membership to any alliance implicates some costs, it also undermines state’s autonomy. If the alliance does not serve the interests of that nation, it would be reluctant to bear those costs and eventually alliance collapses.⁴¹ Zhirkov (2014) employs cross-national survey data to empirically present instances of anti-Americanism at various levels. Zhirkov’s findings are based on the conception that anti-Americanism is persistent phenomena in international public opinion.⁴² He argues by citing data that aggregated anti-Americanism is relatively stable across time, whereas, on individual level, anti-American demonstrates considerably

internal consistency.⁴³ The US has been wielding soft power to build alliances in post-cold war era.

The US tried to address intense anti-Americanism in Pakistan through economic aid and military aid, but these efforts largely failed because of deep ingrained anti-Americanism. US public is no different from Pakistani public. US nationals perceive Pakistan as unreliable partner in bilateral relations. Some of the US congressmen do not have favourable opinion for Pakistan despite Pakistan's sacrifices in US-led war against terrorism. Gary Ackerman, a domestic congressman from New York, said it in May, 2012 that "Pakistan is like a black hole for American aid. Our tax dollars go in, our diplomats go in, sometimes. Our aid professionals go in, sometimes. Our hopes go in. Our prayers go in. Nothing good ever comes out."⁴⁴ Following table of US aid to Pakistan reflects that how the volume of aid drastically increased, but the US policies could not gain legitimacy in Pakistan.

Summary of US Aid to Pakistan (2000-2010)

Year	Economic Assistance, Total	Economic Assistance (through USAID)	Military Assistance, Total	Coalition Support Funds
2000	45.72	0.00	0.00	-
2001	228.02	0.54	0.00	-
2002	937.34	744.74	1,739.70	1,386.06
2003	377.93	284.81	1,760.23	1,450.98
2004	406.12	316.56	891.39	794.11
2005	490.42	374.04	1,397.06	1,050.15
2006	689.43	488.46	1,246.10	916.13
2007	688.62	498.91	1,079.72	755.74
2008	614.48	392.05	1,378.32	1,014.90
2009	1,353.65	1,076.25	1,114.26	685.00
2010	1,867.13	1,529.53	2,524.61	1,220.50

Note: All figures are in US \$ (millions). Figures are adjusted for inflation and presented in 2009 constant dollars

Source: <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jul/11/us-aid-to-pakistan> (This table has been edited for this research)

Total US economic aid from 2000 onwards towards Pakistan increased over the period of a decade. Table of US economic assistance shows that Pakistan kept receiving huge sums of aid as a support to wage efficient war against terrorism. This aid continued even beyond 2010, but US started making vociferous demands that Pakistan needs to do more against Haqqani network and other terrorist networks operating in the region, which further dissipates Pakistan's ties with the US in the years to come.

When media telecasts speeches of the US congressmen or senators like Gary Ackerman discussed in previous paragraph, it literally hurts the feelings of majority of the Pakistanis as they believe that Pakistan's leadership (democratic or undemocratic) has been serving US interest at the cost of their (Pakistan) own betterment. From cold war alliances till non-NATO ally in war against terrorism, Pakistanis believe they got nothing, but a blame that Pakistan is a failing nuclear states and harbouring terrorist elements.⁴⁵ Despite US insistence of cracking down against terrorists and Taliban fighters in North Waziristan, there has been a rationale behind lingering operation because of the starkly divided public opinion on it. When those outlaws renounced any talks with the state and government of Pakistan had exhausted diplomatic channels then operation was indispensable. Now majority of the Pakistanis support military operation against militants and Pakistan has achieved stability in tumultuous areas.

US approach to reduce anti-Americanism has been frail because of infamous policies of interference into internal matters of Pakistan. Washington could not bring refined balance between hard power and soft power in Pakistan. US contribution towards multiple sectors in Pakistan has been appreciable, but was not highlighted much. US aid has contributed to improve Pakistan's energy, education and health sectors and have urged better governance and gender equality in Pakistan. It also had increased capacity of law enforcement by imparting training and better equipment.⁴⁶ Despite these contributions, US could not soften its image in the eyes of common Pakistanis. The US suffered huge loss in war against terrorism because of not having public support from Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Breaching Pakistan's Sovereignty: Covert Operations

Sovereignty is very sacred concept in Pakistan and it means that Pakistan came into being in the name of Islam (Two-nation Theory) and no such law, which is in direct contravention of Quran and Sunnah, be formulated in Pakistan. The Constitution of Pakistan also validates this notion. Second strand of sovereignty is the independent decision-making free from external pressure. Thirdly, no foreign troops would be tolerated on Pakistan's soil. Therefore, drone strikes, though against militant hideouts, could not gain legitimacy in Pakistan.

US bade contract of reconstruction or security of its personnel to private security agencies as it did in Afghanistan and Iraq. The controversy over 'Blackwater' stems from its secret operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. The US contractor, Blackwater also operated in Pakistan at Shamsi Airbase from where CIA had been launching drone strikes. After Baghdad square shooting, which claimed lives of 17 innocent people, this private security contractor rebranded as 'Xe Services' to improve its image. Mr. Leon Panetta (former CIA director) during his term clarified

that many contracts with Blackwater be terminated. Pakistani media showed the images of alleged Blackwater houses in Islamabad, while print media also published numerous stories, which even branded US journalists and officials as Blackwater Operatives.⁴⁷

Raymond Allen Davis, once a private soldier for Blackwater and now a undercover CIA operative, gunned down two Pakistanis and was arrested by police on the charges of murder. His cell phone had surreptitiously taken photos of Pakistan's important military installations and strategic sites. A CIA Director denied that Davis had any connection with CIA and declared him as diplomat. Even President Obama appealed for the release of their diplomat.⁴⁸ But, Pakistan's government, under public pressure refused to release him. Though, it seems to be a small incident, but it became a national issue in Pakistan because of abhorrence of People towards him.

Controversial Drone Strikes

There has been huge hue and cry over drone strikes in Pakistan as they caused intensive collateral damage. Pakistan's government did not halt CIA's drone strikes, but, under public pressure, blamed the US to save their own face. Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, apparently rejected the argument that Predator drone strikes in Pakistan are strategically counterproductive and should be drastically curtailed.⁴⁹ Drones have been counterproductive in destroying terrorists' safe havens because of the collateral damage inflicted by them. Even nation-wide protests against drone strikes could not halt this. Being hawkish, Bush was highly unpopular in Pakistan as he started drone attacks to hunt down terrorists, but surprisingly, Mr. Obama mounted up air strikes against suspected terrorists. According to statistics presented by the South Asian Terrorism Portal, between 2005 to early 2016, there have been total 321 incidents of drone strikes and it killed 2806 people and injured more than 354.⁵⁰ It was devastating for infrastructure as well. Though, CIA claimed that they successfully killed high profiles of al-Qaida, but it also resulted in dozens of unintended deaths.

Rachel Stohl of the Stimson Center, a Washington research foundation, said that "these are exact weapons. The disappointment is in the knowledge about who it is that we are slaughtering". To calm down the public outrage as a result of drone deaths, Mr. Obama, in 2013, announced that no strike is launched without "close sureness that no regular people will be murdered or harmed." Unfortunately, independent investigation of the strikes unfolded that there were far more civilian casualties than officials admit. Imprecision in targets might be the result of poor coordination of intelligence provided by Pakistani government and CIA. Therefore, they have been targeting based on an imperfect best guess. In a speech on drone

attacks in 2013, Mr. Obama declared that no strike was taken without “near-certainty that no civilians will be killed or injured.” He also admitted that “it is a hard fact that US drones have caused many civilian deaths and these deaths will haunt us as long as we live.” The expansion of drone warfare from Pakistan to Yemen gave it a sinister reputation in these countries and provoked people against US policies. It drastically increased anti-Americanism in these countries. Mr. Obama strived to restore US reputation in Islamic countries in particular and world in general.⁵¹ Unpopular policies such as drone strikes tarnished US soft image.

The ‘Operation Neptune Spear’ that resulted in killing of Osama bin Laden at Abbottabad by US SEALs (Sea, Air and Land) on May 1-2, 2011,⁵² brought Pakistan’s security under serious threat. How come, the military operation conducted by the US Naval Special Warfare Development Group, was done without informing Pakistan out rightly breached Pakistan’s territorial integrity. Mr. Hersh’s version favours Pakistan as it says that there was a close coordination between US and Pakistani intelligence and the operation was conducted with Pakistan Army’s permission and knowledge.⁵³ But, CIA challenges this view and claims that Pakistan’s top brass was not aware of it.⁵⁴ Pakistan’s Army Chief, General Ashfaq Kayani in a statement warned the US not to contemplate such operation in future as it was a clear violation of Pakistan’s sovereignty.⁵⁵ As a consequence of US adventure at Abbottabad, there was a wave of anger among military, politicians and public as well. According to the Pew Global Survey, widespread opposition disapproved drone strikes, but it did limited damage to US image in global realm.

Widespread Opposition to Drones

Country	Approve	Disapprove
Pakistan	3	66
India	28	36
China	35	52
US	52	41

Source: Global Pew Survey⁵⁶ (Table had been edited for the paper)

Pakistan and China disapproved more to drone strikes than the US and India. The primary reason for Indian approval for drone strikes was that India never experienced any drone strike from the US.

Empowering India

Amongst the primary factors that stoke anti-Americanism in Pakistan, is the equipping of India militarily. Though, the US enjoys strategic partnership with India, but Pakistan has also been a crucial cold war ally. The heavy price of antagonizing USSR that Pakistan paid to align with the US, masses think, has not been paid back yet. The US strategizes to contain the rise of China and that is only possible through empowering India. A powerful India may prove a stumbling block for China's peaceful rise. Kevin Rudd (former Australian Prime Minister and an expert on China) claimed that China is utterly convinced that the US is pursuing a policy of containment. He summarized Beijing's perception of US goals in five bullet points in a recent Harvard study, i.e., to isolate China, contain it, diminish it, internally divide it and sabotage its political leadership.⁵⁷ For that purpose, empowering India militarily cautions Pakistan's security. But, Washington has never maintained a balance between Islamabad and New Delhi as the former has served Washington's interests more than the latter during the cold war, post-cold war and post-9/11 eras.

As far as execution of US foreign policy is concerned, the US is undeniably the most dominant actor in international politics. Its primary national interest is to check the rise of a challenger to avert threats to US hegemony for an indefinite period. The US has outmanoeuvred the Soviet Union in the cold war and rising challenger in the coming years is China. The US would certainly make all possible arrangements to contain China too. This argument reflects that the US had grand strategy, which addresses gigantic challenges, because great powers have potential to undermine the US at the UNSC, G8 and various other forums of great powers, whereas, a country like Pakistan may not threaten the US and its interests in the region. However, the US always tried to maintain normal ties with Pakistan, but based on historical incidents, radical anti-Americanism has always been an impediment to smooth sailing of Pakistan-US strategic ties. It is worthy to mention once again that the US executes its foreign policy in blatant manner. But, increased anti-Americanism among masses hampers US policy, even it is in the mutual interest, because of deep-rooted mistrust. Common masses view the US as imperial power, who always wants to treat small actors like satellite states. Ayub Khan, the first President and former Chief of Army Staff, had expressed in his memoirs that People of third world countries need friends not masters.

Some of the scholars are of the view that anti-Americanism in Pakistan has not hurt its interests, policies and security, whereas, Pakistan has suffered a serious blowback on diplomatic front. With the proactive support of the US, Pakistan was entitled to enjoy the same status of non-NATO ally as the other members like

Australia, Egypt, Israel, South Korea and Japan. Pakistan could get a civil nuclear deal similar to India-US nuclear deal (2005). That milestone could pave the way for Pakistan to enter into Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) and on later stage, not in near future, Pakistan could become a candidate for the UNSC permanent membership as India is eying for. The argument of the scholars that anti-Americanism in Pakistan did not affect its policies, security and interests stands invalid. Pakistan suffered a lot at economic front, security domain, technological prowess and diplomatic prestige.

The US is the leading donor to Pakistan in terms of aid and grants, and it has waged multiple attempts to minimize anti-Americanism in Pakistan through aid and diplomatic channels to improve US image in Pakistan.⁵⁸ The intermittent US aid towards Pakistan makes people think that the US is not a reliable partner. After successful military operation against terrorists in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), John Kerry acknowledged Pakistan's efforts and sacrifices that Pakistani troops made in war against terrorists. To further uplift Pakistan's military capacity, the US announced selling of F-16 jets to Pakistan. Indian lobby and US Senator (R) Bob Corker virulently opposed this deal to Pakistan.⁵⁹ Now, the US has attached conditions to the deal such as release of Shakil Afridi and ramping up of action against Haqqani network.⁶⁰ Pakistan is much concerned over this diplomatic lax of Washington. Pakistan's Foreign Secretary, Aizaz Chaudhary on May 7, 2016 stated that no conditions should be attached to the sale of F-16s, because Pakistan plans to wield the jets only against terrorists.⁶¹

Later, Lockheed Martin Corp. announced to manufacture F-16 jets at India. That is ipso facto, a mega deal for India as compared to eensy-weensy sale of eight F-16 fighter jets. Johnny Whitaker, Director of International Communications at Lockheed Martin Aeronautics, admitted that India would be able to benefit from the knowledge of F-16 manufacturing indigenously.⁶² Another factor that undermines Pakistan's interest is Washington's emphatic support for India's inclusion into World's most powerful elite club (UNSC) as a permanent member. US President Obama and Indian Premier Mr. Modi, in a joint statement issued at the conclusion of Strategic and Commercial Dialogue at the Headquarters of the State Department, said that "the US side reaffirmed its support for a reformed UNSC with India as a permanent member".⁶³ Pakistan's Prime Minister made it clear upon the US in a telephonic conversation to Mr. Obama that Pakistan would never accept India as a permanent member to the UNSC because of its non-compliance to UN resolutions passed on Kashmir issue.⁶⁴ The US should be cautious in its dealing with South Asian nuclear rivals.

US tilt towards India would frustrate Pakistan and it would seek similar capability from some other countries (China or Russia). Arif Rafique, *President*

of *Vizier Consulting, LLC*, pens that “as the US-India embrace tightens, former cold war foes Pakistan and Russia are bolstering ties with one another”.⁶⁵ As US role in Afghanistan dwindles, Russia sees Pakistan as a critical factor of stability in its backyard. Pakistan’s growing ties with all permanent members of UNSC and regional powers (Iran, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey) make it a ‘pivot state’ in the region. Therefore, ignoring Pakistan and favouring India, would be disastrous for regional peace and stability.⁶⁶ Additionally, US interests in the region would seriously be undermined as well. US-led war against terrorism is still seeking logical end because of the restrained support from Pakistan. Pakistani governments have been under tremendous pressures from the US to launch operations in North Waziristan, which lately was done. But, coercive diplomacy increased rather addressed anti-Americanism in Pakistan.

Pakistan’s current narrative of anti-Americanism had developed around the loops of historical events mostly from cold war times, when the US was obsessed with the threat of Soviet Union. US disengagement from the region allowed Taliban and other transnational terrorists to establish safe havens in Afghanistan and in post-9/11 era, coercing Pakistan to fight against al-Qaida and Taliban increased anti-Americanism even amongst educated class. There was a common thinking in Pakistan that why we were dragged into war? Not ignoring the fact that, anti-American narrative got vibrancy and the US could not achieve desired objectives in Afghanistan. US lawmakers still make allegations against Pakistan that the latter is involved in supporting Haqqani network in Afghanistan. Such statements always proved counterproductive in waging common war against terrorism. Following recommendations provide roadmap to deal with a nuclear armed Pakistan.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Following recommendations can help in appeasing Pakistan’s grievances towards the US and may prop up mutual cooperation on strategic issues:

- The paradox of US support for dictators in Pakistan and appeal for promoting democracy earned her disrepute. Pakistani people expect that the US should take a firm stand against corrupt politicians and dictators. If the US is really serious to promote democracy then should come up with a clear stance that “It will never support any dictator in Pakistan in future”. Though, this is a hard pill to swallow, but would not leave any space for the commoners to hate America for its organized hypocrisy.
- Indian inclusion into the UNSC would give India insurmountable leverage over Pakistan, If, the US wants to stabilize the region (South Asia), then Pakistan should also be considered for the same slot or Indian backing should be dropped.

- Terming Pakistan a 'fragile state' or a 'failing state' or a sponsor of terrorists distorts Pakistan's image globally, whereas, Pakistanis believe that if Pakistan is failing state or a victim of terrorism, it is because of US cold war designs and their outcome. Pakistan needs politico-strategic support to grapple with this gigantic challenge. The US should provide that support without casting doubts about the intentions and capabilities of Pakistan's military and political establishment.
- Despite nuclear deterrence between both the nuclear armed rivals, India is still viewed as the most potential threat to Pakistan's security. Empowering India in military realms undermines Pakistan's security directly, therefore, both the countries should be treated alike. If India is applauded for its economic growth and efficient democratic institutions then Pakistan cannot be blamed for being less democratic and stagnant in economic circles. It served throughout the cold war, post-cold war and post-9/11 as American ally. Pakistan's status as Non-NATO ally should be acknowledged by providing benefits that it is entitled to. That would necessarily boost Pakistan's capability in combating terror and contribute for regional and global peace as a responsible stakeholder.
- Pakistan's partnership in combating war against terrorism and assisting the US for her vested interests in the region should be acknowledged.
- Sneaky exit from the region as was the scenario at the end of the cold war would be a major policy blunder. Reconstruction and rehabilitation of Pakistan and Afghanistan's devastated areas should be the priority.

Pakistan is a pivot state in the region concerning Chinese and US strategic and commercial interests. Because of the intense anti-Americanism among Pakistanis, the US could not achieve desired results in the war against terrorism. Pakistan also went unstable because of the errant terrorist activities. Whatever policies (economic or political) US formulated; Pakistanis refuted them. Common interest of eradicating terrorism, alleviating poverty, promoting trade and development went astray because of the deep-rooted mistrust. There is a need to build new narrative that does not portray the US as imperialist state rather a benevolent Superpower. The US should take people's aspiration into account rather government's spoof plans. Until this goal is achieved, all the efforts, resources and policies are futile to achieve common interests in the region.

Endnotes

¹ Amin, Musarat., Naseer, Rizwan (2013). 'Anti-Americanism in Pakistan: A Theoretical Outlook,' *Pakistan Horizon*, 66(4), 69-70.

² Frej Jackson. 'Anti-Americanism, not Anti-Americanism,' available at website

http://journalism.berkeley.edu/projects/worldandus/archives/2005/04/from_keo_hane_an.php.

³ Katzenstein, Peter J., and Robert Owen Keohane. *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*. Cornell University Press, 2007.

⁴ Anti-Americanism by Musarat Amin see: <http://epaper.pakobserver.net/201604/21/comments-1.php>

⁵ Anti-Americanism by Tod Lindberg, Suzanne Nossel, see <https://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/conferences/reports/fall/AA.pdf>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Lerski, George J. "The Pakistan-American Alliance: A Reevaluation of the Past Decade." *Asian Survey*, no. 5 (1968): p.402.

⁸ Markey, Daniel S. *No exit from Pakistan: America's tortured relationship with Islamabad*. Cambridge University Press, 2013: p.75-77

⁹ Ibid.77

¹⁰ Lerski ,p.403

¹¹ Markey, p.72

¹² Markey, p.73

¹³ Ibid.74

¹⁴ Riedel, Bruce. *What We Won: America's Secret War in Afghanistan, 1979–89*. Brookings Institution Press, 2014.p.ix

¹⁵ Khan, Rashid Ahmad. "INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHAN REFUGEES." *Pakistan Horizon* 38, no. 1 (1985):99

¹⁶ Ibid.99

¹⁷ High life: Punjab has highest number of drug users, says UNODC report

Accessed, January12,2016, <http://tribune.com.pk/story/711844/high-life-punjab-has-highest-number-of-drug-users-says-unodc-report/>

¹⁸ Prados, John. "Notes on the CIA's Secret War in Afghanistan." *The Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (2002): 468

¹⁹ Burke, Jason. "Frankenstein the CIA created." *The Guardian [online]* 17 (1999). see: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/1999/jan/17/yemen.islam>

²⁰ Fair, C. Christine. "The US-Pakistan F-16 Fiasco." *Foreign Policy* 3 (2011). see: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/02/03/the-u-s-pakistan-f-16-fiasco/>

²¹ Krasner, Stephen D. *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*. Princeton University Press, 1999.p.1-5

²² Dobell, W. M. "Ayub Khan as President of Pakistan." *Pacific Affairs* 42, no. 3 (1969): P.297

²³ Kennedy, C. H. (1990). Islamization and legal reform in Pakistan, 1979-1989. *Pacific affairs*, 62

²⁴ Kronenfeld, Daniel A. "Afghan refugees in Pakistan: not all refugees, not always in Pakistan, not necessarily Afghan?" *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21, no. 1 (2008): 43

²⁵Opcit. Lerski, p.959

²⁶Opcit. Reidel P.100

²⁷ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations see:
http://www.international.gc.ca/protocol-protocole/vienna_convention-convention_vienne.aspx?lang=eng

²⁸ Rakisits, Claude. "Engaging Pakistan." *Policy Brief* (2008): 1-10.

²⁹ Hagerty, Devin T. *The consequences of nuclear proliferation: Lessons from South Asia*. MIT Press, 1998.p11

³⁰Opcit. Lerski, p.967

³¹ Van Hollen, Christopher. "Leaning on Pakistan." *Foreign Policy* 38 (1980): 35-50.

³² Ahmed, S. (1999). Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons Program: Turning Points and Nuclear Choices. *International Security*, 23(4), 178

³³ Zunes, S. "Pakistan's dictatorships and the United States foreign policy in focus." (2007).

³⁴ Fair, C. Christine, Keith Crane, Christopher S. Chivvis, Samir Puri, and Michael Spirtas. *Pakistan: Can the United States Secure an Insecure State?* Rand Corporation, 2010.P.178

³⁵ <http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/pakistan/database/natoattack.htm>

³⁶ (Zakaria, Fareed. "Hating America." *FOREIGN POLICY-WASHINGTON*-(2004): 47-49) <http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/23/hating-america/>

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. "An unnecessary war." *Foreign Policy* 134 (2003): 50

³⁹ Maszka, John. *Terrorism and the Bush Doctrine*. Terrorism and the Bush Doctr, 2008.p.13-14

⁴⁰ Directorate General of Immigration & Passports Ministry of Interior <https://www.interior.gov.pk/>

⁴¹ Walt, Stephen M. "Why alliances endure or collapse." *Survival* 39, no. 1 (1997): p.158

⁴² Zhirkov, Kirill. "Anti-Americanism as a Mass Attitude: Estimating Stability and Consistency Using Cross-National Survey Data." P.1

⁴³ Ibid

⁴⁴ Op.cit.Markey, P.5

⁴⁵ Fair, C. Christine. "Try to see it my way." *Foreign Policy, Af-Pak Channel* (2011).

⁴⁶ Epstein, Susan B., and K. Alan Kronstadt. "Pakistan: US Foreign Assistance" *Current Politics and Economics of the Middle East* 4, no. 3 (2013): 575.

⁴⁷ Mazzetti, Mark. "CIA Sought Blackwater's Help to Kill Jihadists." *The New York Times* 19 (2009)

⁴⁸ Mazzetti, Mark. *The Way of the Knife: The CIA, a Secret Army, and a War at the Ends of the Earth*. Penguin, 2013, p.4

49 Admiral Mullen: Drone strikes in Pakistan are "very effective" by Thomas Ricks

<http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/05/19/admiral-mullen-drone-strikes-in-pakistan-are-very-effective/>

⁵⁰ Drone attacks in Pakistan (2005-2016) see:
<http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/pakistan/database/Droneattack.htm>

⁵¹ Shane, Scott. "Drone Strikes Reveal Uncomfortable Truth: US Is Often Unsure About Who Will Die." *New York Times* 23 (2015). 24.

⁵² O'Rourke, Ronald. "Navy Irregular Warfare and Counterterrorism Operations: Background and Issues for Congress." LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WASHINGTON DC CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, 2013.P.5

⁵³ What do we really know about Osama Bin Laden's death? By Jonathen Mahler see: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/18/magazine/what-do-we-really-know-about-osama-bin-ladens-death.html?_r=0

⁵⁴ Have we been told the truth about Bin Laden's death? By Jane Corbin <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-33152315>

⁵⁵ Don't do it again, Pakistan Army Warns US by Patrick Goodenough, see: <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/don-t-do-it-again-pakistan-army-warns-us>

⁵⁶ Global Opposition to US Surveillance and Drones, see: <http://www.pewglobal.org/2014/07/14/global-opposition-to-u-s-surveillance-and-drones-but-limited-harm-to-americas-image/pg-2014-07-14-balance-of-power-0-01/>

⁵⁷ Browne, Andrew. "Can China Be Contained?" *The Wall Street Journal* 12 (2015).

⁵⁸ US concerned about Image in Pakistan, *Express Tribune* see: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/268889/us-concerned-about-image-in-pakistan/>

⁵⁹ Indian Clamouring over F-16 Sale by Dr.Rizwan Naseer ,see:

<http://pakobserver.net/2016/02/21/indian-clamouring-over-f-16-sale/>

⁶⁰ Need Modern F-16 Jets but without Conditions from US, *Hindustan Times*, see: <http://www.hindustantimes.com/world/need-modern-f-16-jets-but-without-conditions-from-us-says-pakistan/story-HBuoZn8cHLgQYzd5FwnChL.html>

⁶¹ Ibid

⁶² US' Military Aid to India could Irk Pakistan, *The Washington Times*, Ashis Kumar Sen, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/7/pentagon-officials-favors-high-tech-aid-to-india/?page=all>

⁶³ US backs India's Bid for a Permanent UN Security Council Seat, *The Indian Express*, see: <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/us-backs-indias-bid-for-permanent-unsc-seat/>

⁶⁴ Pakistan Will Not Accept India as UNSC Permanent member, *DAWN* see: <http://www.dawn.com/news/1163163>

⁶⁵ <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/pakistan-russias-new-best-friend-13945>

⁶⁶ Ibid