

A HISTORY OF U.S FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS ANTI-TERRORISM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES ON PAKISTAN

Ali Imran*; Dong Xiaochuan

School of History and Culture, Northeast Normal University, 5268 Renmin Street, Changchun 130024, P.R. China

ABSTRACT: *During the last months of 1980s, Russian forces started their encroachment of Afghanistan and America's administration has already known the hidden interests of Soviet Union- i.e. control of Persian Gulf oil and warm water- so that U.S has decided to backing the Afghan rebellion movements and providing the billions of dollars and every kind of arms. Under the American aiding, these movements become the dangerous for world's peace and eventually attacked on World Trade Centre (WTC). After the biggest tragedy of WTC, combating of anti-terrorism was the major objective of the American administration. As the retaliation of terrorism, the U.S declared the 'War on Terror'. A broad-based America's foreign policy for anti-terrorism has to be assumed in every part of life and even national and international level. Eventually, America's these policies towards anti-terrorism showed the various negative consequences on Pakistan, which not only destabilized the government and creates the lot of troubles but also destroyed the billion dollar's property of Pakistan. This study has been distributed in three parts. First part of study will discussed about the America's backing policy towards rebellion movements and rising of Talibans. Second part of study will be focus on U.S anti-terrorism policy and particularly focus will be on America anti-terrorism policy towards Afghanistan-Pakistan and using of international forces against terrorists. Anti-terrorism policies negative consequences on Pakistan will be discussed in the third part of the study. This imperative study aims to understand the concealed history of U.S anti-terrorism policies and their negative implications on Pakistan. Furthermore, through this study we can understand the U.S major anti-terrorism policies and how U.S makes and applies these policies against terrorism after 9/11.*

KEYWORDS: U.S Policy, Taliban, Anti-terrorism Policy, Drone Strikes, Destabilizing of Pakistan

U.S SUPPORTING POLICY AND RISING OF TALIBAN

As the political environment of Afghanistan was worse during the last era of 1980s and this was the big chance for U.S.S.R to achieve their secret goals so that U.S.S.R send their own military in Afghan region and started the invasion of Afghanistan so the United States policy makers began to attention on Afghan situation and focus on their foreign policy towards Afghanistan. U.S tries to adjust the comprehensive strategy to tackle the Afghan situation. U.S administration and his policy makers see all the situation of the Afghan region and finally they started to aid the insurgent movements. During the 1982, the U.S had funneled the almost seven billion U.S dollar to insurgent movements (Lamb, 1991). The upgrading programmes along with anti tank missiles, communication system, tanks, aircraft, and other various facilities were also provided to them. Gates (2007) stated in "From the Shadows" that U.S President permitted to Central Intelligence

Agency (CIA) for provision of billions of dollar to Afghan insurgent movements against U.S.S.R. During 1998, Brzezinski also stated in an interview that CIA funneled the millions of dollar to Afghan rebellions as financial support. He also stated that U.S president allowed the aid for Afghan rebellions through memorandum during 1979 and I (Brzezinski) also wrote a memorandum to president for the provision of aid to insurgent movements and this aid is going for intervention of U.S.S.R from Afghanistan (Brzezinski's, 1998). During U.S-Soviet Cold War, not only U.S provided the billions of dollar and every kind of support for Afghan rebellions but Saudi Arabia also provided the billions of dollars. Saudi Arabia was biggest ally of the United States for provision of supporting to Afghan rebellions during Cold War and Saudi Arabia matched dollar-for-dollar with U.S for supporting the insurgent movements and Azzam admit that Saudi administration was the biggest ally of U.S as foreign volunteers in Afghan war.

Due to U.S, Saudi Arabia and other international actor's financial and other various kind of support, Afghan insurgent movements became the strongest and at least these movements changed into Taliban and now these Taliban are the biggest threat for global peace. These Taliban also started the worldwide terrorism and finally attacked of 9/11 on U.S and it was treacherously true in connection to United States foreign policy during Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, a truth brought home to U.S on 9/11 attack. Eventually, United States declared the war on terror as revenge and makes their policy for anti-terrorism.

9/11 ATTACK AND U.S FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS ANTI-TERRORISM

9/11 attack, it appears that well-correlated/synchronized attack, hijackers/terrorists crashed planes into World Trade Center's (WTC) Towers of United States and eventually destroyed the both towers. The third one hijacked plane cultivated into Pentagon and another one hijack plane rammed towards Pennsylvania, raising conjecture that a connected operation had unsuccessful. As an estimation of State Department of U.S that due to attack on WTC, approximately 3000 peoples were died including seventy eight different countries in crashing of WTC alone. A research in 2001 by Partnership and Chamber of Commerce of New York estimated that approximately total destruction of economics during WTC attack was 83 billion U.S dollars.

After the biggest disaster of WTC, combating of anti-terrorism was the key objective of the U.S. There was also the wide support from every part of U.S even civilian, government and political spectrum of U.S. The obligation for anti-terrorism, which was frequently declared as 'War on Terror'. During 1998, U.S President Bill Clinton affirmed that U.S was in "a long" ongoing war between fanaticism and freedom, between terrorism and rule of law (Clinton, 2000). President Clinton later stated to UN General Assembly that 'terrorism is now key objective of U.S and should be key objective of global (Bill, 2000)'.

A broad-based U.S policy towards anti-terrorism has to be assumed in every part of life and even International, national and regional levels are same, which is as under:-

- a. *The first one is, no any kind of concession or compromise will be made with terrorist or arsonist and no any kind of agreement or deal will be made with them.*

- b. *Secondly, terrorists should be trialed and for exile agreement between nations should be signed for deportation of required terrorists to their own states.*
- c. *Third, such countries which sponsored the terrorists not only remote but they should be forced by worldwide for changing their sponsor's policies.*
- d. *Fourth, anti-terrorism potential of those states who are fighting for anti-terrorism should be enlarged and every kind of aid be given by UN and other partners of world community.¹*

U.S changed their foreign policy towards anti-terrorism, and they use various tools of statecraft. They used diplomacy, Democracy, military and Intelligence, criminal justice, financial control, military and Intelligence as foreign policy towards anti-terrorism. Approximately all tools bears on various elements of anti-terrorism policy.

U.S Diplomacy and Democratic Policies for Anti-Terrorism

U.S Diplomacy policy touches various features of anti-terrorism as do some other tools. While United States diplomats rarely acquire the opportunity and chances to apply their diplomatic abilities personally on terrorism, the spirit of diplomacy-eloquent strategy to foreign interlocutors, influence them, and do agreement with them-obviously must be element of efforts that essentially depend so slowly on engagement with foreign organizations and countries. Diplomatic way is connected with every tool of anti-terrorism. Through conciliatory and U.S imaging, it affects on the ways of violence. United States anti-terrorism diplomatic instrument is not finite to what the U.S State Department do. Every tool of anti-terrorism necessitates not merely unilateral act by U.S but also the mobilization of collaboration from foreign counterparts. U.S diplomatic policy or diplomacy helped the various tools in many different approaches.

In the current era, U.S “under their diplomacy and democratic policy” has joined the various multilateral conferences on anti-terrorism in which the environment was constructive. G-8 gathering was also important towards anti-terrorism which was held in 1996 and in this conference 25 points were recommended for instance, information sharing, developing the tools of counter-terrorism and energetic trials of terrorists. Furthermore, Security Council has also takes the touch actions against terrorists in Afghan region. During 1999, Resolution 1267 was recommend, in this resolution the income of Bin Laden, Ban of Arianna Afghan Airline and freezing the terrorists accounts and their assistance were demanded.

U.S President George W Bush in his speech during 2005 cleared about the encouraging of democracy in the global. He stated that:-

‘is to help change the conditions that give rise to extremism and terror, especially in the broader Middle East. Parts of that region have been caught for generations in a cycle of tyranny and despair and radicalism. When a dictatorship controls the political life of a country, responsible opposition cannot develop, and dissent is driven underground and toward the extreme. And to draw attention away from their social

¹ . Department of State, Patterns of Global Terrorism 1999 (2000), p.2.

and economic failures, dictators place blame on other countries and other races, and stir the hatred that leads to violence. This status quo of despotism and anger cannot be ignored or appeased, kept in a box or bought off'.

Furthermore, during 2004, John Kerry (Senator) stressed on the political developments in the Middle East for essential achievements in war on terror. Besides, U.S policy maker, Martin Indyk, also focused on democracy. He writes that terrorism in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Egypt is mostly due to poverty and illiteracy and these problems can be solved through democracy. Thomas Friedman (a writer) was also agreed on this opinion and supports this point (Gause, 2005).

Criminal Law

U.S Criminal Law policy towards anti-terrorism has become the more import instrument of America's efforts towards counter-terrorism. Arrested terrorists and trials of them have been often used as scorecard of big achievement, not only due to evident or visible but they reflect the most prominent of the United States anti-terrorism agenda. Furthermore, two more important developments in Criminal Law Policy have been seen, first, during 1990, considerable incensement in investigation tools that law enforcement agencies devoted to violation and terrorism. Second, increasing in Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agents from five hundred fifty in 1993 to one thousand and found hundred in 1997.² Beside, FBI budget was also increased from four per cent during 1993 to ten per cent during 2010.³ During 1999, a big reforming was made in FBI by giving them their own director and divided their own division. Which makes them so strong and at least they showed the major improvements in anti-terrorism.

Financial Control

It has been seen that money has played the key role in terrorism and anti-terrorism. Financial assistance defiantly has been a major element of state sponsorship of terrorists, and most significant element of the support that various countries have provided to various terrorist organizations. The rising of Bin Laden as so strong and the leader of terrorists was also due to prosperity and financial assistance to terrorists. Furthermore, financial control have been a focal

² . Counterterrorism and Infrastructure Protection, testimony of FBI Director Louis Freeh, Hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, February 4, 1999, 106 Cong. 1 Sess. (Government Printing Office, 1999), pp.42-56.

³ . The FBI Federal Bureau of Investigation. *'The FBI Budget for the Year 2010'*. <http://www.fbi.gov/news/testimony/the-fbi-budget-for-fiscal-year-2010> Accessed on 27 Jul 2012.

point of consideration of those hopeful to built global authorizations by killing or targeted them more precisely at criminal and didn't at innocent fatalities.⁴

The U.S has also makes the critical policy as financial control against terrorism, they divided the financial controls policy into two categories, first, U.S freeze the accounts which belongs to terrorist organizations, terrorists, state sponsors and also controlled the prohibited materials which supported them. Second, under the International Emergency Economic Power Act, U.S blocked the state sponsor's assistance and other various orders.⁵ All the nominated sponsors' countries have been freeze the property in U.S. The recently freeze of the government's property was managed under the 2009 executive order number-13129.

The major achievements have been freezing the property of that countries, which accounts were not secret than those terrorists and organizations. Under the U.S financial controls policy, during the last years of 1990s, almost three billion dollars of state sponsors were freeze in U.S. The major part was belongs to Iraq, and that amount was fifteen billion dollars. \$252 million of terrorists were also frozen by U.S under Executive Order number 13129. Palestinian and Hamas terrorist's amount ten millions were also frozen in under the executive order of IEEPA. Except these properties, any other amount was not blocked by U.S (ARC, 2000). These decisions for anti-terrorism through financial controls show the great achievements in counter-terrorism.

Using of Military Force

The usage of force was a less blunted than before, due to advancement in technology but also U.S tried to less use of military for anti-terrorism than other various counter-terrorism tools. Since almost a decade ago, U.S openly used his military for anti-terrorism for instance, on ground in Afghanistan or drone attacks in Afghan-Pakistan. The advancement in United States forces has consequently come through new commanding structure that developed into Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) and this is mostly used against anti-terrorism.

The usage of military forces by U.S have become the most important tool against anti-terrorism but mostly they used as retaliation against the terrorism and U.S Revenge has become the significant anti-terrorism usage of United States military power. Initially, the U.S used it against Libyan during last years of 1970s, as retaliations of attack on Discotheque on 4th April in which various American were killed and injured and United States attack as retaliation on 14th of this month by using of various aircrafts. Second retaliation was against Iraqi terrorists during 1993 as revenge of assassination of U.S President George Nush. During this retaliation attack, U.S used the various cruises missiles and tried to destroy the Intelligence agencies of Iraq. During 1998, the

⁴ . A bibliography of recent work on "smart sanctions" is at www/smartsanctions.ch/papers.htm (October 2000).

⁵ . IEEP is 50 U.S.C. 1701-06.

attack against Bin Laden was the third attack as retaliation of bombing in American Embassy in Dar Salam and Nairobi and in this attack, U.S also used the cruise missiles.

According to various polls that the Americans support the using of military as retaliations of anti-terrorism, for instance, Chicago Council Foreign Relations showed that seventy four per cent common peoples and seventy seven per cent leaders are agree on using the military forces as retaliations against terrorism (John, 1999).

During 2008, U.S President Barak Obama gave his suggestions as foreign policy for anti-terrorism. He stated that as retaliations of WTC attack, U.S should makes the foreign policy against counter-terrorism against Al-Qaida in Pakistan-Afghan regions. Obama (2011) stated that;

'We could have deployed the full force of American power to hunt down and destroy Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda, the Taliban, and all of the terrorists responsible for 9/11, while supporting real security in Afghanistan'.

He further asserted that we should fight against terrorism and till to win the war against terrorism (Obama, 2011).

After Obama come in office, U.S makes his foreign policy towards anti-terrorism stricter and drones attacks have become the major policy instrument in United States anti-terrorism strategy. Mostly, America's drone were strikes in Pakistan, Somalia, Iraq, Yemen and Afghanistan during last decades for the purpose of anti-terrorism and these strikes also become the main debates within U.S and international policy makers (Living Under Drones, 2014). Under the policy of usage of military forces, during 2013, U.S president Obama acknowledge that Ameica is using his forces and drone attacks for the purpose of counter-terrorism against Al-Qaida and his allies (Obama, 2011). Furthermore, president stated that America is on war on terrorism against Al-Qaida and his allies as his self-defense.

Although, U.S used the forces against terrorism in different forms, for instance, ground attacks, air attacks in various countries but this use was also rejected by international community and these drone also showed the various negative implications on Pakistan.

U.S Coordinating Policy

The boundaries of all anti-terrorism tools make it essential to use all of them. Furthermore, these instruments should be correctly used. Mostly, anti-terrorism strategy develops in various tools. U.S security departments and diplomatic policy played the key role in all anti-terrorism steps.

The United States anti-terrorism group was developed during last decade of twenty century and the main responsibility was provided to Counter-terrorism Security Group (CSG) and other part of these groups were FBI, CIA and some other important anti-terrorism parts. The CSG have played the key role in U.S anti-terrorism steps and still have the key role in countering of terrorism. CSG is also group of agreements and deals against terrorism and this group do the various deals between terrorists and U.S. The present CSG charter was signed during 1998 and his name is Presidential Decision Directive 62 (White House, 2000).

Although CSG play their role as negotiations between U.S anti-terrorism authority and terrorists. Under the U.S foreign policy towards counter-terrorism, the United States provided the financial support, armaments, and training of those peoples who were against terrorism. Under these strategies, less importance is essential on emerging of forces structures to make sure of defence and counter-terrorism (Richard, 2010).

U.S Peace Process Policies

However, the U.S was always on target of terrorists and also has world's strongest military against terrorism. It has been seen that proponents accepted the America's peace process team as world best interlocutors and peace process. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and Colombia's negotiation was the biggest example of the U.S peace process policy (Richard, 2010). Furthermore, during 1996, U.S provided the hundred million to Isralian government for anti-terrorism and peace process with Palestine.

U.S also adopted the bearing and peace process policy in every step for anti-terrorism. London terrorism by IRA during 1996 was also a big step by terrorists, due to this activity, a big deal between government and terrorists was broken, Adams didn't criticize this terrorist's activity but he possibly endorsed the same terrorism activities. In reaction of this activity, Washington's don't block their funds but they continue to maintain the peace process policy with terrorists (Stevenson, 1996). Another U.S peace process policy was seen in Afghanistan during 2011 in Bonn Conference, in which U.S and his anti-terrorism partners were to create peace agreements and Talibans were encouraged to participate in this conference. In this Bonn Conference, it was declared that reconciliation and peace process between Taliban and U.S will be preferred and these should be on true Afghanistan led, inclusively and owned for all Afghani peoples.⁶ Beside, Joe Biden (America's V/President) affirmed that Taliban were not the enemies of United States and we want to peace with them (Gelb, 2011).

For the U.S broad approaches towards anti-terrorism and peace process with terrorists, a conference was held with Haqqani Taliban with the help of Pakistani officials in Dubai, but this was fail due to some internal problems. Mullen Admiral criticized and rejected the support of Haqqani group and stated that they were not serious for peace process and negotiation for peace (Schmitt, 2011).

⁶ . *Letter dated 6 December 2011 from the Permanent Representatives of Afghanistan and Germany to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, United Nations General Assembly, 66th Session, Agenda Item 38, 9 December 2011.*

Sheikh and Greenwood (2013) affirmed that under the U.S peace process policy for anti-terrorism, U.S various time tried to negotiation with terrorists, for instance:-

- a. *March 2009, Obama proposes the notion of reaching out to moderate elements of the Afghan Taliban.*
- b. *November 2010, Direct contact between the Taliban and US officials begins in Munich, Germany, brokered by German officials and Qatari royals.*
- c. *February 2011, Preliminary talks in Doha between the Taliban and the US about the release of five Guantanamo detainees, including three senior commanders, in exchange for an American soldier.*
- d. *May 2011. Preliminary talks in Germany between the Taliban and the US.*
- e. *January 2012. The Taliban meets with American officials in Qatar to discuss preliminary trust-building measures, including a possible prisoner transfer. The Afghan and Pakistani governments are no directly involved but have reluctantly accepted the negotiations.*
- f. *March 2012. Negotiations between the US and the Taliban break down, among other reasons due to disagreement over whether the Taliban commanders released from Guantanamo would remain under supervision in Qatar or not.*

States Sponsor's Policy

U.S anti-terrorism policy not only for using forces, coordination with terrorists but U.S also makes their policies against those states that support the terrorism or facilitates the terrorist's organizations or even help them in any kind of terrorism.

Terrorism sponsors states were officially nominated under the United States laws. During 1979, under the Export Administration Act, a list of those countries was prepared that support, facilitates or helps the terrorism.⁷ After a decade of enactment of this law, various foreign activities were controlled and ban on any kind of support the in listed states.⁸ The official record of changing in the law showed that the types of support or help for terrorism that meet to criteria of countries for nomination includes but it was not limited to documentary support, financial, accommodation, or governmental support (Perl, 2001).

Under the U.S state sponsors policies, during 2000, the names of seven countries were listed as states sponsors to terrorists, i.e., Iran, Libya, Sudan, Syria, North Korea, Iraq, and Cuba. Taliban's regime in Afghanistan was also designated as state sponsors but their government was recognized by U.S as government. Pakistan was also not in state sponsors list because it was not as per the criteria of state sponsor's list and United States has various others interests in this state.

Over a decade, the United States has taken various cautious but greets decisions towards the countries which support the terrorism and sanctioned the various laws against them. United States also makes various changes in his political steps and foreign policies towards state sponsors (Suzman, 1999). During 1999, medication and foodstuff was exempted by President Bill Clinton for Sudanian, Iranian and Libyan and also gave easiness for traveling and trading to North Korea.

⁷ . Counterterrorism Act, 50 U.S.C. App. 2405 (6)(j)

⁸ . Counter-terrorism and Arms Export Amendments Act of 1989, P.P. 101-222.

During 2000, America-Iran relationship was also changed and their governments gave permission for luxury items for trading but various Iranian properties were still banned.

U.S COUNTER-TERRORISM POLICY AND ITS CONSEQUENCES ON PAKISTAN

Although U.S makes the various foreign policies towards anti-terrorism and Pakistan also played the key role in the “war of terror”. U.S also used his and NATO forces against terrorism, especially in Afghan-Pak region. Due to anti-terrorism activities, a lot of troubles and other problems were emerged in Pakistan.

Flees of Refugees

U.S used their forces (as mentioned above) against terrorists in Afghanistan and they used the all ways (i.e. drone attacks, ground attacks) for counterterrorism. Due to attacks on Afghanistan, almost one out of three were migrated towards Pakistan. Before this, during Afghan-Soviet war, Pakistan has already received the million of refugees from Afghanistan. Finally, as outcome of these conflicts (during cold war and war on terror), Pakistan received millions of more Afghanistan refugees, which was the biggest problem for Pakistan and its nation. According to a study, Pakistan received three millions of Afghan refugees during war (Jeffrey, 2002). Which was the biggest refugee’s quantity in the global and this flood also creates the serious troubles in all areas of the region.

As per Pakistani spokesperson, half million Afghan refugees were migrated towards Pakistan during Bajur war. Mostly out of them were sheltering with their relatives within Pakistan region, while 100,000 refugees were taken camps within Pakistan, which were provided by Pakistan.

These refugees brought almost three million of livestock with them, which showed the harmful effects on the region and regional environment. The United Nation High Commissioner reports that forty five thousand of camels and twenty five thousand of donkeys were brought with Afghan refugees (Farr, 1990). These refugees also destroyed the greenery and lot of forests of Pakistan, which showed the negative effects of Pakistan’s environment life. Beside, these used the wood for cooking and other requirements which also destroyed the forest life (Samdani, 1982). Various unskilled were also migrated towards Pakistan during U.S attack on Afghanistan and they worked as cheapest labor and worked as hawkers, shoe sellers, tea sellers and various others which disturbed the other poor peoples of Pakistan (Boesen, 1990).

Afghan refugees were also started the transportation in Khyber Pakhtoons Khaw (KPK) and Baloch region. As an estimated that six thousand different kinds of Afghani vehicles were transfer to Pakistan and these were temporary registered and various were without registrations. Only within KPK almost nine hundred trucks, fifty buses, two hundred minibuses, one hundred and fifty tractors, four hundred cars, and twenty motor cycles; and totally one thousand and seven hundred only vehicles were registered by them (Farr, 1990). More than this quantity was unregistered vehicles. These refugees also do the illegal smuggling between Af-Pak border and due to these activities, during this era, the prices of rice and wheat in Pakistan were so high. This all were blamed by these refugees (Weinbaum, 1993). Actual troubles began during Afghani tax free imports through smuggling towards Pakistan and almost all markets of Pakistan were decorated with these items and every kind of items i.e. crockery, tea, plastic goods, electronics, electrical

were availed. During 1993, only tea smuggled was almost four hundred millions (Ahmad, 1993). These all peoples were migrated towards Pakistan due to U.S used their forces against terrorism in Afghanistan.

U.S Drones Strikes and Pakistan

The declaration of “War on Terror” also ends the Taliban’s regime in Afghanistan but terrorists activities were still continue. Due to Pak-Af nearest borders, U.S and NATO stressed that terrorists have been migrated towards Pakistan region and there they have safe haven and also they creates various troubles for U.S and NATO forces, anti-terrorism forces claimed that Talibans and others various local terrorists also helped and joined the terrorists groups from Pakistan border (Crews and Tarzi, 2009). Eventually, under these argues and assessments, U.S and NATO forces attacks on Pakistan northern regions, which were the biggest threat for Pakistan internal control and peace and further retaliations by terrorists.

U.S Anti-terrorism Activities and Revenge by Terrorists

It has been seen that before the U.S attacks in Pakistan against terrorism, there were no any terrorism activities. According to a report that U.S drone strikes showed the significant negative effects on Pakistan and further added that continue attacks by drones also increased the terrorism activities in Pakistan as retaliation (Jaeger and Siddique, 2011).

Various examples showed that U.S and NATO attacks against terrorists were revenged by terrorists. For instance, suicide bombing in Lahore Police Academy during 2009 was also retaliation by Baitullah Mehsud in response to U.S drone attack in Pakistan (*BBC*, 2009). Furthermore, attack on military forces in KPK during 2013 in which twenty four civilians and military persons were killed. The attack was accepted by Talibans that announced that this is as retaliations of America’s drone strikes (*Tribune*, 2013). In the similar approach, Faisal Shahzad’s bombing in Time Square during 2010 was also a revenge of United States drone attacks in Pakistan and other Muslim counties, especially in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Judge of Court asked to Faisal Shahzad that why you bombing on innocent and naïve peoples, he replied that America’s drone attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq killed and injured the millions of peoples and they also don’t care anyone (Shifrel et al, 2010).

These all activities by U.S against terrorists and terrorism, it has been seen that U.S foreign policies against terrorism and revenge by terrorism showed the negative consequences on Pakistan.

Suicide Bombing and Other Terrorist Activities in Pakistan

The trend of suicide bombing specially in Pakistan begins after the U.S attacks on Afghanistan 2001 and particularly in Pakistan during 2004. Initially, these bombing were started during 1980s by Palestinian attacks on Israeli peoples and; after this, these suicide bombing were prolonged in various other countries i.e. Kenya, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghanistan (Shai, 2004).

In the current era, Pakistan is at 2nd in worldwide ranking of country which faced the international terrorism. Only during 2012, death of civil peoples was increased up to 3007, in which mostly were from Karachi, forty four per cent, after this Balochistan, twenty three per cent, after this FATA eighteen per cent and finally, twelve per cent was in KPK. Additionally, 344 casualties

were due to U.S drone strikes in the same year. During January and February 2013, almost 620 peoples were killed in various different terrorist activities (Krepon and Thompson, 2013). During 2007, 2196 peoples were killed and 3498 were injured in different terrorism activities and during 2008, these activities also increased and 2680 were killed and 5002 were injured.

During 2009, thirty six suicide bombing incidents were happened and 465 peoples were killed and almost more than 1100 were injured (Mir, 2009). Terrorist's suicide attacks during 2002 to 2009 indicate that the sixty per cent were within KPK and FATA. Twenty per cent attacks were only in Punjab and mostly out of them were only in military areas Rawalpindi. And the twenty per cent were in all other areas of Pakistan. Due to Pakistani, U.S and NATO forces offensiveness in southern areas of Pakistan, the Talibans focused their minds towards targeting to military, police, and other government officials (Zaidi and Manzar, 2010). The number of suicide bombing and casualties has been increased in Pakistan. Benazir Bhutto "the former prime minister of Pakistan" was also victim by terrorists in Rawalpindi in the suicide attack.

The last decade (2002 to 2012) has destroyed and destabilized the Pakistan, this condition was not before this, even Pakistan has fought the various wars, earthquake, or floods; but suicide bombing and other various kind of terrorism activities has traumatized and upset the state. These activities has outcome not only in the form of deaths and injuries of peoples over than thirty thousand but also destabilized the economy of billions of dollars. International Monetary Fund Poverty reported that during 2010, \$25 billion economy was destabilized and destroyed in Pakistan due to terrorism activities. Beside, Pakistan's ambassador in U.S "Sherry Rehman" stated that during 2001 to 2010, Pakistan has lost his economy almost \$25 billion dollars due to terrorism.⁹

During an interview to BBC New, the Former Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani stated that, Pakistan as frontline country in war on terrorism has sacrificed more lives and also more destabilized than any other state in the global. He also added that world community understand and solve the terrorist activities in Pakistan, which stalk from economically lack and unsettled political situation in the region.

A Pakistani writer stated that the peoples and state of Pakistan is ultimately loser. Further he added that Pakistan have lost their more forces as compare to United States have lost their in Afghan region during war on terrorism and hundreds of normal Pakistani have been executed by their own peoples. Beside, Pakistani forces are killing their own peoples in the name of terrorists and these peoples are killing as retaliations to them.

⁹ . Conference on Determining Factor for Eradication of Terrorism in Five Years, Islamabad, February 24, 2011.

<http://www.circle.org.pk/images/Conference%20Report%20%28printing%29.pdf>(accessed April 28, 2013).

The Former President of Pakistan, Asif Ali Zardari advised to the Pakistani Nation to realize that Pakistan is now in the situation of state of war and underscored the require to arrange the new planning for dealing with this situation. He stated that *“We have to increase the appetite for the acceptance of (the fact) that we are in a state of war,”* the President also added that *“We can’t wish it away.”* During his discussion in New York, he also defined the foreign policy issues of Pakistan during his tenure. The President articulated that Pakistan is in frontline in war on terror so U.S and NATO forces should stop their invasion in FATA and various other area of Pakistan and also stop their involvement in internal situation of Pakistan, but no any assurance was given by U.S administration in this regard.

U.S Using Force (Drone Strikes) and It’s Socially, Economically, and Political Consequences on Pakistan

American drones fly long times over the combat areas for collection of information and take the security of these areas and this information was used by drone operators to destroy their targets and get their objectives; these information have significant impact on drone strikes. It has been observed in various studies that while drones fly in the sky for collection of information or getting their objectives, anxiously, the peoples of that area feels that it should be attacked. The same situation has been seen in FATA area of Pakistan that when U.S drone fly in the sky, the peoples of these areas feels that this should be attack and feels fear (Living Under Drones, 2014). Not only drone strikes fear among the peoples of FATA area but mostly the peoples of that area thoughts that the local peoples of the area also gave the information to U.S and NATO forces and fit the chips which gave the information to NATO forces for targeting the terrorists and also destabilized the regional peace, damaging the property of peoples and big threat to security. After this terrorists captured the suspected peoples and punished them in front of all peoples; makes their video and warn to the regional peoples for doing these activities and cooperation with security forces (Express, 2013). This kind of activities has big psychological and negative effects on the peoples of FATA.

Various scholars and a lot of studies proved that U.S drone strikes hamper and harp the FATA’s culture and also various other combat activities, for example, attacking on Jirga in FATA area, in which killed the various tribal leaders and other peoples. It has been seen that tribal leaders currently hesitate to hold the Jirgas or other same kind of gathering due to the drone strikes (Living Under Drones, 2014). During 2011, for instance, the U.S drone attack on Jirga of Ditta Khail in Northern Area of Pakistan, in which only 4 were Taliban and other were general peoples and their leaders but there were forty peoples were killed by U.S drone strike (Shah, 2012).

American drone strikes not only have psychologically effects on Pakistani peoples and administration but also these strikes have big negative consequences on Pakistan’s political situation. The government of Pakistan and civilian, both are anxious towards U.S drone attacks on Pakistan. According to William study, former President of Pakistan, Asif Ali Zardari, inform to General David during a conference about the U.S drone strikes and the troubles towards it. The former President stated that the continually using of U.S drone attack in Pakistan has destroyed the economy, lot of causalities of civilians and also various problems for Pakistani administration.

It also creates the credibility gaps between Government of Pakistan, Pakistani peoples and also creates the negative views towards American Government (Williams, 2010).

Due to U.S drone strikes and growing of hostility against these strikes, Pakistani administration is in critical situation. The America's drone policy towards Pakistan has become more dangerous within last few years; As per Pew research towards drone strikes in Pakistan, only 17 per cent peoples of Pakistan support the U.S drone strikes against terrorists and it has also been seen that these strikes have been conducted under the supervision of Pakistani government (Pew, 2012).

Anti-U.S sentiment -due to their foreign policies towards drone strikes particularly towards Pakistan- have been seen during 2012 in Imran Khan's protesting march against drone strikes in Pakistan, in which millions of Pakistani were participated and these peoples were tried to enter in FATA areas (Masood, 2012).

Destabilization of Tourism in Pakistan

There are various beautiful, historical and visiting places in Pakistan and the most famous places are, Murree, Chitral, Narran, Swat, Kagan and Hazara. Every year thousands of foreign visitors were visited to Pakistan. After the U.S war on terror and specially attack on Afghanistan and various terrorists were migrated towards Pakistan and then U.S attacks Pakistan regions, these all activates effects on Pakistan and foreign visitors. In the current era, no any want to visit to Pakistan due to terrorism. This terrorism was based due to Afghan refugees, terrorists from Afghanistan to Pakistan and then U.S anti-terrorism activities against these terrorists. According to a study, Britain administration inform to his citizen to avoid for visiting towards Pakistan.¹⁰ These kinds of decision have negative effects on Pakistan.

Anarchism in Pakistan

Due to millions of refugees and terrorists were migrated towards Pakistan during U.S attack on Afghanistan against the terrorists and Osama Ben Laden. Eventually, U.S and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) also attacks on Pakistan and Pakistan enemies got a good chance for lobbying against Pakistan. Finally, due to terrorists, terrorism and threat to global peace, Pakistan was seen as world's anarchism state.

¹⁰ . "Is Pakistan Safe For Tourists." Around the World Blog, 2011.

<http://aroundtheworldblog.blogspot.com/2011/01/is-pakistan-safe-for-tourists.html> (accessed

February 10, 2014).

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S. (1993) Rs. 100 bn worth smuggling Subverts the Economy'. Dawn Newspaper, 5 November 1993.
- ARC, (2000) *Annual Report to the Congress on Assets in the United States Belonging to Terrorist Countries or International Terrorist Organizations*, 1 March 2000, pp.8-11, 14-15.
- BBC, (2009) *Lahore 'was Pakistan Taleban op.* BBC News, March 31, 2009. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7973540.stm. Accessed on 20 July 2011.
- Bill, C. (2000) *Remarks by President Bill Clinton to the Fifty-Third United Nations General Assembly, September 21, 1998.* www.state.gov/www/global/terrorism/980921_pres_terror.htr. Accessed on 7 December 2000.
- Brzezinski, Z. (1998) *Brzezinski and the Afghan War Pt2*, Brzezinski's Interview, <https://Www.Youtube.Com/Watch?V=Rgjasqjh7om&Feature=Relmfu> assessed on 10 January 2010.
- Boesen, I. W. (1990) *Honour in exile: continuity and change among Afghan refugees.* The Cultural Base of Afghan Nationalism: 160-176.
- Clinton, B. (2000) *Address to the nation by President Bill Clinton, August 20, 1998.* www.state.gov/www/regions/africa/strike/clinton980820.ahtr. Accessed on 7 December 2000.
- Crews, R. D. and A. Tarzi (2009) *The Taliban and the crisis of Afghanistan*, Harvard University Press.
- Express, (2013) *Drone strike informant: spy who ensnared Mullah Nazir killed.* The Express Tribune, 24 January 2013. <http://tribune.com.pk/story/498349/drone-strike-informant-spy-who-ensnared-mullah-nazir-killed/>. Accessed on 28 January 2014.
- Farr, G. M. (1990) *Afghan refugees in Pakistan: definitions, repatriation and ethnicity.* The Cultural Basis of Afghan Nationalism, Londres, Pinter: 134.
- Gates, R. M. (2007) *From the shadows: the ultimate insider's story of five presidents and how they won the Cold War.* Simon and Schuster.
- Gause III, F. G. (2005) *Can democracy stop terrorism?.* Foreign Affairs: 62-76.
- Gelb, L. (2011) *Joe Biden On Iraq, Iran, China and the Taliban.* Newsweek, 19 December 2011.
- Jaeger, D. A. and Z. Siddique (2011) *Are drone strikes effective in Afghanistan and Pakistan? On the dynamics of violence between the United States and the Taliban*, Discussion Paper series, Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit.
- Jeffrey, P. (2002) *Afghan Refugees Find Hope in Camps.* Anglican Journal.
- John, E. R. (1999), ed. *American Public Opinion and U.S Foreign Policy 1999.* Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 1999, p.27
- Krepon, M., and J. Thompson (2013) *The battle within Pakistan.* The Stimson Center. <http://www.stimson.org/spotlight/the-battle-withinpakistan/accessed%20march%204/>. Accessed on 29 April 2013.
- Lamb, C. (1991) *Waiting for Allah. Pakistan's Struggle for Democracy.* New Delhi: Viking Penguin Book: 86.
- Living Under Drones, (2014) *Living Under Drones: Death, Injury and Trauma to Civilians from US Drone Practices in Pakistan.* <http://www.livingunderdrones.org/report/>. Accessed on 29 January 2014.

- Masood, S., (2012) *In Pakistan, Drone Protest Takes Detour for Safety*. New York Times, 7 October 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/08/world/asia/in-pakistan-drone-protest-led-by-imran-khan-takes-detour-for-safety.html?_r=0. Accessed on 14 January 2013.
- Obama, B. (2011) *Obama's remarks on Iraq and Afghanistan*. New York Times, 15 July 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/15/us/politics/15text-obama.html>. Accessed on 14 June 2011.
- Perl, R. F. (2001) *Terrorism, the future, and US foreign policy*. DTIC Document.
- Pew, (2012). *Pakistani Public Opinion Ever More Critical of U.S.* Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewglobal.org/2012/06/27/pakistani-public-opinion-ever-more-critical-of-u-s/>. Accessed on 18 October 2012.
- Mir, A. (2009) *Pakistan turned into suicide capital of the world*. Middle East Transparent. 3 July 2009. http://www.mettransparent.com/spip.php?page=article&id_article=7514&lang=en. Accessed on 18 June 2012.
- Richard N. H. (2010) *We're not winning, it's not working: here's how to draw down in Afghanistan*. Newsweek, 18 July 2010. <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/18/we-re-not-winning-it-s-not-worth-it.html>. Accessed on 16 May 2011.
- Samdani, Z. (1982) *The Afghan refugees: the human aspect*. Pakistan and Gulf Economist, 24-25.
- Schmitt, E. (2011) *For US, a Tricky Path in Dealing With Afghan Insurgents*. The New York Times, 5 October 2011.
- Shah, Z. (2012) *Analysis: US drone strikes in Pakistan's tribal areas create backlash*. Global Post, 10 October 2012. <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/asia-pacific/pakistan/121010/analysis-us-drone-strikes-pakistans-tribal-areas->. Accessed on 23 October 2012.
- Shai, S. (2004) *The Shahids: Islam and suicide attacks*. Transaction Publishers.
- Sheikh, M. K. and M. T. J. Greenwood (2013) *Taliban talks: Past present and prospects for the US, Afghanistan and Pakistan*. DIIS Reports, Danish Institute for International Studies.
- Shifrel, S., Alison, G and Jose, M. (2010) *Remorseless Times Square car bomber Faisal Shahzad warns: We will be attacking the U.S.* Daily News, 22 June 2010. <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/crime/remorseless-times-square-car-bomber-faisal-shahzad-warns-attacking-u-s-article-1.181486>. Accessed on 21 December 2010.
- Stevenson, J. (1996) *Northern Ireland: treating terrorists as statesmen*. Foreign Policy, 125-140.
- Suzman, M, (1999) *Tyranny of Sanctions*. Financial Times, 19 August 1999, p.14.
- Tribune, (2013) *Vengeful Taliban: Brazen attack on security forces in Lakki Marwat*. The Express Tribune, 3 February 2013. <http://tribune.com.pk/story/501974/vengeful-taliban-brazen-attack-on-security-forces-in-%20lakki-marwat/>. Accessed on 24 August 2013.
- White House (2000) White House Fact Sheet, *Combating Terrorism: Presidential Decision Directive 62, 22 May 1998*. www.usinfo.state.gov/journals/itps/0798/ijpe/pj38trfx.htm.
- Weinbaum, M. G. (1993) *The impact and legacy of the Afghan refugees in Pakistan*. Contemporary Problems of Pakistan: 135.
- Williams, B. G. (2010) *The CIA's covert Predator drone war in Pakistan, 2004–2010: the history of an assassination campaign*. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 33, 10, 871-892.
- Zaidi, A., S. Manzar (2010) *Demographics of suicide terrorism*. Dawn.com, 5 August 2010. <http://archives.dawn.com/archives/30744>. Accessed on 2 February 2013.

Imran Ali,

Room Number # 623, International Student Dormitory, Northeast Normal University, Renmin Street 5268, Postal Code 130024, Changchun, Jilin Province, P.R. China.

Contact Number, 008615584204353"

Imran Ali,

"中国吉林省长春市. 东北师范大学 人民大街 5268 号。邮编：130024, 留学生公寓 房间号：0623 阿克塔

Contact Number, 008615584204353"
