

M.S RESEARCH PROPOSAL

**THE US POLICY TOWARDS AFGHANISTAN UNDER THE TRUMP
ADMINISTRATION: IMPACTS ON PAKISTAN**



Researcher

Syeda Hijab-e-Zainab
Reg. No.178-FSS/MSIR/S21

Supervisor

Dr. Nasreen Akhtar
Department of Politics & IR

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY, ISLAMABAD
(December 2022)**

Table of content

List Of Abbreviations -----	ii
Abstract -----	iii
1. Introduction -----	1
1.1 Problem Statement-----	4
1.2 Objectives of the Study-----	4
1.3 Research Questions-----	5
1.4 Significance of the Study-----	5
1.5 Delimitation of the Study-----	5
1.6 Operational definition of Major Terms-----	5
1.7 Literature review-----	6
1.8 Research methodology-----	9
1.8.1 Research Design-----	9
1.8.2 Data Collection-----	9
1.8.3 Data Analysis-----	10
1.9 Organization of the study -----	10
Chapter 2 -----	11
2. Theoretical framework -----	11
Chapter 3 -----	18
3. Historical background -----	18
3.1 The Great Game of Afghanistan:-----	18
3.2 Anglo-Afghan Wars:-----	18
3.3 After WWI: Afghanistan-----	19
3.4 Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan:-----	21
3.5 Operation Cyclone:-----	22
3.6 Mujahedeen's and Afghanistan:-----	23
3.7 Rise of Taliban:-----	24
3.8 9/11 and Afghanistan:-----	25
3.9 War on Terror and Role of Pakistan:-----	27
3.10 Aftermath of 9/11 on Pakistan:-----	29
Chapter 4 -----	33
4. Trump Policy Towards Afghanistan -----	33
4.1 Trump and Afghanistan:-----	34

4.2 Trump’s New Approach:-----	34
4.3 Trump Policy deviates from the Previous Administration:-----	35
4.4 Trump Inclination towards India:-----	38
4.5 Why Trump’s so harsh towards Pakistan:-----	39
4.6 China’s Reaction towards Trump harsh argument on Pakistan:-----	41
4.7 Russian response towards Trump harsh statement against Pakistan:-----	42
4.8 Pakistan-Iran Stance on Afghanistan:-----	45
Chapter 5-----	47
<i>Pakistan’s Response towards Trump Policy-----</i>	47
Chapter 6-----	51
6. Trump Afghan policy’s Implications for Pakistan-----	51
6.1 A weak Neighbor: Threat to Pakistan.-----	53
6.2 Security Implications for Pakistan:-----	55
6.3 Economic Implications for Pakistan:-----	56
6.4 Indio-US Partnership; Implications for Pakistan:-----	58
6.5 Trump’s Policy: Impact on US-Pakistan Relations-----	60
6.6 Trump Afghan-Peace Plan: Implications for Pakistan-----	61
6.7 Afghan-Peace Process and the Pakistan’s Role:-----	62
Conclusion-----	64
Bibliography-----	68

List Of Abbreviations

APS	Army Public School
BBC	British Broadcasting
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CPEC	China-Pakistan Economic Corridor
CSF	Coalition Support Fund
CICA	Confidence-Building Measures in Asia
FATF	Financial Action Task Force
FMF	Foreign Military Financing
ISI	Inter-Services Intelligence Agency
ISISs	Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
NSC	National Security Committee
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OBOR	One Belt and One Road
PDPA	People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan
QCCM	Quadrilateral Cooperation and Coordination Mechanism
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organization
NSC	National Security Committee
QCG	Quadrilateral Coordination Group
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
US	United States

ABSTRACT

Trump's "America first" policy has shifted the focus of foreign policy goals away from international disputes to America-centric. Therefore, United States foreign policy has observed a paradigm shift vis-à-vis Afghanistan. Trump has reduced US troops and initiated its evacuation from Afghanistan. Moreover, with the assistance of Pakistan, peace talks have been held in Doha, Qatar between the United States, and the Taliban. Along with this, the United States and Pakistan relations are on the right track. On the other hand, India, which has hegemonic ambitions in the region, felt a little insecure due to the Taliban's growing area of influence in Afghanistan and Pakistan and its growing relations with United States. US President Donald Trump came up with different strategy towards Afghanistan compared to his predecessor, President Obama. This thesis tries to find the reason of trump's pacifist approach regarding Afghanistan. Moreover, this thesis also examines the impact of these policies on Pakistan.

1. INTRODUCTION

The belligerent land of Afghanistan has set a special geo-strategic location, bordering with Pakistan from east and south, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan lie in its north and Iran is in the west. Due to its geo-strategic location Afghanistan is also known as the heart of Asia. Afghanistan lies in Central Asian region which has its own cultural, economic, and geo-political importance. Afghanistan faced a series of hostilities in history due to its geo-strategic location. Most of the external powers including US strived to invade Afghanistan. Recurring invasions by foreign powers destabilized her and peace turn into war, hence Afghanistan named as graveyard of Empires (Dawson, 2021). After the deadliest attack of 9/11, the US decided to invade Afghanistan and meanwhile initiating hunt to find Osama Bin Laden, leader of Al Qaeda, who was some where in Afghanistan according to their intelligence (Lloyd, 2022).

Afghanistan government gave shelter to Al-Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden. The US government warned Afghanistan that if they do not hand over Osama Bin Laden to them, the US will attack. Afghanistan government refused, because of this US invaded Afghanistan and it was the time when Afghanistan once again became the target of external power (Tricia, 2018). US launched operation known as “Enduring Freedom” against Afghanistan, removed Taliban, and replaced them with new government. After a successful operation, US stationed its troops in Afghanistan and when Obama came into administration, he increased number of deployed troops. Here President Obama made a mistake in 2003 and invaded Iraq, blamed that Iraq had Weapons of Mass Destructions (WMDs). Due to this US attention diverted from Afghanistan to Iraq. As a result, the Taliban in Afghanistan started to resurge (Rabia, 2013).

After putting Osama Bin Laden to death in 2011, US was willing to sit on table with Afghan government and Taliban. As more than hundred thousand US troops were present in Afghanistan, after the negotiation, Obama was willing to reduce the number of deployed troops in Afghanistan. The US and Afghanistan government signed a bilateral agreement and US gradually reduced its deployed troops there. The US and its NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) allies provided training to Afghanistan armed forces, so that they were able to defend themselves from future attack by terrorists. Gradually the US forces withdrew from Afghanistan but in 2015, the situation in Afghanistan again deteriorates and in 2016 Taliban reemerged. The US administration changed, and Donald Trump came up in power and made different strategies regarding Afghanistan (Cutler, 2017). Trump decided to increase number of deployed troops in Afghanistan unlike Obama, but he didn't share the exact number. Trump decided to start negotiation with Taliban in 2019 and for this matter he took help from Pakistan as a mediator, but these talks failed because Taliban refused to cope up with Afghan government and again started violence. In that whole scenario, the fate of foreign policy of Pakistan, and India regarding Afghanistan was yet to be decided.

Pakistan plays its significant role for decades and Trump also wants economic assistance from India. This thesis investigates that the US strategy towards Afghanistan under the President Donald Trump and its impact on India and Pakistan.

India and United States had ties in the past, but they were not strong enough due to Pakistan's relations with US. On the other hand, Pakistan was a frontline state against Soviet Invasion and war on terror afterwards. So, America has no other choice but to keep robust ties between Pakistan and itself. In the last period of this decade, United States felt threatened from

China's growing power in the world. To curb China, US decided to incline towards India to counter Chinese threat.

Therefore, Afghanistan played a pivotal role in relations between US and Pakistan. Moreover, Afghanistan war had profound implications on relations between India and Pakistan. Pakistan always wanted to have Pro-Pakistani government in Afghanistan to use it as "strategic depth", the policy which ultimately backfired. On the other hand, India used Afghan land to challenge peace and order in the western part of Pakistan. India's proxy war against Pakistan and Pro-Indian government in Afghanistan has further deteriorated the relations between India and Pakistan (Peter, 2013).

1.1 Problem Statement

September 11, attack gave United states green signal to invade Afghanistan for apparent reasons i-e to eradicate terrorism and to hunt down Al-Qaeda's leader Osama bin laden, the primary accused of September 11 attacks. After toppling up Taliban's regime, American backed government took charge. In 2003, US invaded Iraq, consequently shifting the focus towards Iraq. The Taliban seized the opportunity, regrouped, and resurged. When Obama took charge, he continued the Bush doctrine but increased the number of troops, to weaken the Taliban. In 2011, Osama bin laden got killed in Abbottabad, a city in Pakistan. Yet President Obama decided to keep the substantial number of troops to remain in Afghanistan. This Obama's policy saw paradigm shift when Donald trump took charge.

This research attempts to explore the changing US policy which is developing peace process in Afghanistan under Trump Administration and its impact on Pakistan. As Pakistan is the neighboring state of Afghanistan, the situation in Afghanistan has spillover effect on her.

Secondly, Pakistan is also important for building peace in the region, so it is necessary to find out the impacts of US policy on Pakistan.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

- To explore the change and continuity in US policy toward Afghanistan under the Trump Administration.
- To analyze the impact of Trump policies on Pakistan strategic interests.
- To investigate Pakistan response towards Trump's strategy in Afghanistan.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What was change and continuity in Trump's policy towards Afghanistan?
2. How far did Trump's policy impacts Pakistan's strategic interest in Afghanistan?
3. How did Pakistan response towards Trump's strategy in Afghanistan?

1.4 Significance of the Study

This research focuses on the US policy towards Afghanistan under Trump's Administration and its impacts on Pakistan. This research will enhance reader's knowledge vis-a-vis Trump's policy and particularly its impacts on Pakistan, the border sharing partner of Afghanistan. Trump's peace policy has been widely discussed in research papers; this thesis will add new knowledge in the ambit of the implications of those policies on Pakistan.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The delimitation of the study is basically a flaw in any research. The flaws of any research occur when reader wants more data or information in the study This research is purely based on the Trump's peace policy towards Afghanistan which is limited to the period from 2017 to 2020. This thesis will discuss the era of Donald Trump's

administration, its change of policies during that period, and its ultimate impacts on Pakistan.

1.6 Operational definition of Major Terms

Enduring Freedom: Operation launched by US to remove Taliban replaced them with new government.

Policy: A strategy to conduct foreign relations.

Intra-State: within a state between Taliban and Afghan government.

Negotiation: Talks between the US, Afghan government, and Taliban.

Paradigm shift: A basic change in approach or underlying assumptions

Strategic depth: Strategic depth is a term widely used in military paradigm and refers to the distance between front lines of the battlefield and combatants. This strategy was opted by Pakistan's military against India.

1.7 LITERATURE REVIEW

Mohammed Ehsan Zia in his research paper, "An Analysis on Peace building Approaches in Afghanistan" explains about Afghanistan conflict. He argues that it's hopeless to bring peace in Afghanistan. Ehsan Zia also analyzes peace building approaches adopted by US and other actors in Afghanistan. He explains various causes of Afghanistan conflict. According to him political talks became the hurdle for US in bringing peace in Afghanistan (Zia, 2000). As there are number of internal and external factors involved in Afghanistan and due to presence of their interests it's difficult to have stability in the State.

Courtney Cooper in her article, "Afghan ceasefire could pave path to Peace", discusses that the Afghan government leader Ashraf Ghani with help of US and its NATO allies initiated a good effort in order to bring peace in the region from one side and on the other hand Taliban also

agreed to them. According to the writer! both parties, Afghan Taliban and Afghanistan government were willing to negotiate with each other and ready for maringating peace in the region (Cooper, 2018). US initiated negotiation with Taliban because Taliban wanted that theywould first negotiate with the US, as Taliban considered Afghan government the main puppet of externals. For US Intra Afghan Dialogue was most important matter at that time so they agreed, and this was the moment when both Afghan parties agreed on a ceasefire.

Grant Farr in his research paper, “What happened to the Afghan Peace Talks”, talks about the February 2020 event known as Doha Accord which was signed between the US and the Afghan Taliban. Writer in his article tells the reasons that led to the failure of agreement. The one main reason in the failure of this peace deal is the lack of clarity because this deal was initiated by the president Trump but the government in US changed which created mistrust among Afghan Taliban (Farr, Feb 24, 2021). As initially both Afghanistan Government and Taliban failed to reach an agreement. And both intra state parties hoped that in the second phase their negotiationswould reach a conclusion but the change in administration came up with the change in policies which led to create mistrust and the lack of clarity was the main reason to discontinue their intra Afghan peace dialogues.

Revisionist policies of United States former president Donald trump towards South Asia in august 2017, gave a new strategically framework for India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. This policy at times converges with Obama’s policy towards the region but sometimes it deviates particularly in the connotation of India. The south Asian region is dynamic and has immense potential for change and this has been further exacerbated by Trump’s policy. Trump’s viewpoint regarding Pakistan is harsh and he preferred the Indian role and influence in Afghanistan, which Pakistan found to be threatening and concerning for her national interests

(Owais, 2019). Islamabad cannot afford her arch-rival New Delhi in the backyard. “Do more” slogans have already hurt the sentiments of a bunch of Pakistanis who have lost nearly 1 lac people in an American war on terror.

Pakistan has always craved for peaceful Afghanistan due to its vitality for regional stability. Pakistan is the primary victim of the unceasing Afghan war Moreover, War in Afghanistan is unfavorable for not only the region but for the entire world, which is primarily due to its geo-strategic location. Peaceful Afghanistan will ensure a successful transit route via Central Asia. Chinese projects will not only facilitate Afghanistan, Pakistan, and China but also the whole region. But the prerequisite for this is peace in Afghanistan. The only solution lies for Afghanistan’s problem is a dialogue. Pakistan being a staunch believer in peace played a vital role to bring the Taliban to the table talks, which resulted in successful peace talks between the United States and the Taliban also known as Doha accords signed on February 29, 2020 (Mustafa, 2020). The world recognized the role played by Pakistan and this acknowledgement accompanied by praise has improved Pakistan’s image throughout the world.

India’s influence in Afghanistan surged after the US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001. India strategically involved in Afghanistan because of her shattered dream of becoming a regional hegemon, and to achieve its broader agenda and realist ends through soft power. Not only this but India also had a stake in the collective commitment of the global community to re-build war-ravaged Afghanistan. Afghanistan is the only way out for India to reach Central Asian Republics, Iran, Russia, China and even beyond, as this is the only continental trade route, bypassing Pakistan. In this way, India not only enhances its influence in the region but also in its peripheries and around the globe. One of the major interests of India in Afghanistan is to curtail the dominance of Pakistan in Afghanistan along with the comprehensive range of

interests as discussed above that goes beyond the rivalry between India and Pakistan (Kamal.M, 2020).

The economic importance of Afghanistan cannot be neglected in terms of India's interests. Those are primarily due to the unique geostrategic location of resource rich Afghanistan and its importance in inter-regional connectivity. For this reason, Afghanistan is key to India's New Silk Road, which is intended to interface exchange, travel, and energy supply from central Asian locale to south Asia, particularly India (Owais, India and Pakistan Strategic Influence in Afghanistan: Pros and Cons of Rivalry, 2020). Another reason for Indian intervention in Afghanistan is due to exponentially growing ties between New Delhi and Washington. Washington wants to curb the economic expansion of China and Delhi as its front-line soldier for this purpose. India wants to restrict progressive Chinese economic base in Central Asian Republics through Afghanistan

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology is especially important part of research. According to the Neuman, "Research methods are the new ways to find new dimension of reality (Neuman, 2014)".

This thesis is going to analyze "the US policy toward Afghanistan under Trump's Administration: Impacts on Pakistan". To find the new dimensions of reality researcher uses following research methods.

1.8.1 Research Design

It is overall plan based on which research is design (Bhandari, 2021). This research is qualitative and exploratory in nature based on various secondary data sources.

1.8.2 Data Collection

To collect and analyze data on US policy towards Afghanistan under Trump's Administration and its impact on Pakistan, researcher relies on various primary sources such as interviews which is semi-structured in nature based on open-ended questions and secondary sources such as books, journals, various reports, speeches, and reviews of public discourse.

1.8.3 Data Analysis

To analyze this qualitative data, researcher uses the technique of content analysis in which researcher analyses the various concepts, to address research questions and interpret data and based on their interpretation, researcher draws conclusion (Shannon, 2005).

1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This research is organized into five chapters and these five chapters step by step address the research questions of the study. First chapter discusses the Introduction and historical perspective, and its second chapter explains the theoretical framework and its relevancy with the topic. Third chapter explains the Trump's peace policy towards Afghanistan. Forth chapter discusses the role of India in Afghanistan and the impact of Trump's policy on its interests and the last chapter of the research discusses the role of Pakistan and impact of Trump's policy on Pakistan.

Chapter 2

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

11 September 2001 is a sad day in the history of the United States of America. The country's integrity and national security were challenged when some terrorists hijacked an airplane on a fine September morning and crashed two planes into the twin towers of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon in New York City. This led to the invasion of the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan.

Although the invasion of Afghanistan is claimed to be a defensive act by the United States of America, however, the world does not view it through the same lens. The USA is a hegemonic state, whereas Afghanistan was a least developed country. It does not make sense that a powerful hegemonic state would go on war with a country that was already in a crisis. At the end of 20th century Afghanistan fell into the misery of a civil war when Taliban took over the government. The country was being run by the Taliban, whom the whole world was considering to be terrorists. It was believed that the Taliban were working for Osama Bin Laden and according to the intelligence services of America, the 9/11 attack was planned and executed by Laden's men.

As there is anarchy in the international system, states go for power maximization to ensure their survival. The state which has more power in the international system acts as a hegemonic state (Whyte, 2012). US due to her interventionist approach, tends to muddle in affairs of global nature. It is evident from US invasion of Iraq, the Afghanistan episode, and Vietnam War. US enhance its sphere of influence, to maximize power and to gain interests and structural imbalances in the international system. Raison d'état in international affair plays the pivotal

role and US's interests are supreme and will be protected whatsoever. To maintain her power and strength, US invade other weak states and create instability in the region. Those states which are weak and failed to response eventually descend into chaos or war (Hudson, 1996).

However, after the 9/11 attack, President George Washington Bush declared the global war on terror, mainly against Afghanistan and Iraq. More than 90 countries supported the USA in this global war. A war that was assumed to be a month-long lasted for more than two decades. This research analyses the Global war on Terror initiated by the USA as a reaction to the attack on the national security of the state.

The theoretical lens used in this study is Neo-Realism. Power Politics and conflict as associated to the theory of Neo-Realism. Kenneth Waltz, father of neo-realism, argued that the theory is an integrated study of global politics where states operate as units and as part of a system in his famous writing "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory". According to him, there is anarchy in international arena which disrupts the global order. Many powerful states create unrest and instability in the system to promote chaos and disturbance (Walt, 1988).

Post 9/11 episode has cascading effect on the region and global level. US invaded Afghanistan, topple Taliban regime and stamped and once again promulgated its global hegemony. Although the USA invaded Afghanistan to wipe out terrorism and to regain its integrity as a hegemon. As the Afghanistan episode unfolded, it had domino's effect in the region, particularly Pakistan (Yousaf, 2017).

Kenneth Waltz, coined the term Neo-Realism. According to him, anarchy and conflict are a part of the international system and there is very little room for cooperation. The president of the USA Bush called the 9/11 attack to be an attack on the freedom of the state. It is a common rule

in the international politics, that a state does everything to protect its territorial integrity and national security. The number one thing for every state is its survival and when it is challenged the state actors take necessary actions to protect it.

This invasion had economic, political, security, and social consequences on the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. When the USA invaded Afghanistan, it had severe consequences on Pakistan, and they lasted for more than two decades. Pakistan's social status in the international arena was challenged, Pakistan's economy became unstable, unemployment increased, and many lives were lost.

Neorealism theory talks about states that want to pursue relative gains. State actors tend to focus on power and supremacy, thus giving little thought to economic and social factors. The international system is brutal as powerful states tend to form rules and force them on states weaker or lower than them in power. To stay in the international system certain actors, struggle because they must abide by certain rules and policies thus getting little opportunity to pursue their own national strategic interests (Cai, 2011).

When the USA executed its Global War on Terror, it stated any state that supports the USA in this war is an ally and any state that does not is an enemy to the USA. Thus, leaving little opportunity for Pakistan to protect its own territorial integrity (NATO and Afghanistan, 2022).

By 2001, almost 5 million Afghan refugees migrated to Pakistan and Iran. This caused a disruption in Pakistan, socially as well as economically. Millions of Afghan refugees migrated to Pakistan, and this brought a lot of disruption to the country. This led to groups giving out fake Pakistani Id cards to the Afghan refugees who later started leaving the refugee camps and

started earning money, getting involved in criminal activities thus creating more social problems for Pakistan.

The invasion of Afghanistan also led to the fleeing of many Afghans Taliban's into the rural areas of Pakistan. The Taliban's started hiding there and creating their militant bases within Pakistan. Thus, threatening the territorial integrity of Pakistan and questioning its national security (Anwar, 2021).

Pakistan provided a military base to the USA thus supporting drone attacks by the USA to the Taliban hiding in Pakistan. This led to the loss of life of Pakistani citizens and military. Pakistan supported the USA in the great war of terror even though Pakistan had to face a lot of complications and consequences for it. These rising tensions were threatening the national security of the country.

The USA claimed to invade Afghanistan to capture the leader of AL-Qaeda, Osama Bin Laden and to end terrorism. A decade later in 2011, the USA through its strategic planning was successful in installing a USA-prone government in Afghanistan and captured the Al-Qaeda leader. However, the USA still did not leave the country. The USA invasion cost USA a lot of money, and its army, however a heavy price was paid by the government of Pakistan as well (Akhtar, 2011).

All the terrorists that came to Pakistan from Afghanistan created their own militant group called, 'Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan'. The formation of this group was the result of the USA invasion of Afghanistan.

Although the Terrorist threat to the national security of America ended with the death of Osama Bin Laden, but the suffering for Pakistan did not end. Pakistan opened its air space for

American drones to kill high-profile terrorist leaders, this was beneficial for the USA, but it became an even bigger problem and a threat for Pakistan.

Every high-profile leader that was killed by USA drones resulted in a revenge attack by the Terrorists on Pakistan. These revenge attacks did not limit to the military of Pakistan but extended to the public of Pakistan (Sarwar, 2009). The day 16 December 2016 is considered as a black day in the history of Pakistan, as on this day almost 114 children were massacred by the terrorists (Kalim, 2019).

Moreover, in late 2007, the terrorist also took control of a district in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa region of Pakistan. The terrorists cut ties in this region from the rest of Pakistan and created chaos for the locals. The district started to be known as ‘The Land of the terrorists. Pakistan spent so much time, money, and energy into getting its district back from the Taliban. Pakistan spent money on the rehabilitation of its district and the military operations it did to evacuate terrorists from the country. Pakistan made a lot of effort to strengthen its national security and territorial integrity. This was a ripple effect of the USA invasion of Afghanistan (Abbasi, 2014).

The USA is a hegemon, it is a superpower, whereas Pakistan is a developing country. When the USA invaded Afghanistan, it focused on protecting its national security, it did not foresee the consequences it would have on the Southeast Asia region. This proves that states are selfish. They don’t see cooperation in the system, they only see their national interests and they form policies that would help them pursue them (Hellen, 2023).

After all those years of Pakistan supporting the USA in its Global war on terror and in gaining its national security back USA repaid Pakistan by calling it out on, providing secret hiding places to the Afghan Taliban’s. In a tweet, Donald Trump the former president of the United

States of America blamed the government and military of Pakistan to be supporting terrorists. This act by the former president shows how much anarchy there is in the system. No matter how much a state tries to support or cooperate with a hegemon or a powerful state, it cannot expect cooperation in return. This however proves the neorealist perspective that the system is violent and there is very little or no cooperation in the international arena (Saba, 2018).

During Trump's era, both the states and non-state actors (Taliban) agreed on initiating peace talks to end the conflict and bring stability back to the region. During these peace talks, there were many mediators, including Pakistan, that were there to encourage peace in the Southeast Asian region. But these talks kept on failing because the parties were unable to find a common ground to agree on (Phillips A. , 2021). In the end, when Trump's administration ended and Joe Biden came to power, the USA was so flushed by spending two decades on a self-created problem that it decided to immediately withdraw its military from Afghanistan. Thus, leaving Afghanistan in chaos and façade. When the USA withdrew its military, the (USA-prone) president of Afghanistan ran away from the country as well due to the increasing tensions and chaos. Thus, Taliban came into power again thus taking Afghanistan back to the place where it was before, two decades ago (Staff, 2023).

Although the United States of America is a strong hegemon in the system it still has a strategic thirst for the region of Southeast Asia. The USA entering Afghanistan was not only there to fight the terrorists, but it further started to align its foreign and defensive policies towards its other national interest that was to stay a hegemon in the system. With China's growing economic ties in the Southeast Asia and Europe, the USA did feel threatened by its status as a hegemon in the international system. The USA knew if it stayed in this region, it would be able to keep an eye on the economic strategy being implemented by China. As China is a rising

hegemon, stayed in Afghanistan even after it achieved its goal of deterring terrorists to never attack its homeland ever again seemed beneficial to the USA. As China formed its ties with Pakistan, the USA formed strong ties with India, to balance the power shift in the Southeast Asia. Everything that the USA has done is to maintain its status as a hegemon in the system, proving that the international actors are not scared to go to war when it comes to national interest, hence putting the consequences of the war in the background, completely ignoring them (Gazis, 2023).

Thus, proving the USA's invasion of Afghanistan was not effective yet destructive. Under the lens of neorealism, this again proves that there is nothing but anarchy in the system. There is a conflict that outshines the international system and there is no room for cooperation.

Chapter 3

3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Afghanistan is full of natural resources such as opium, heroin production, natural gas, and oil present in large number. America invaded Afghanistan due to its large number of resources but due to instability America failed to avail natural resources. America lost trillions of dollars in Afghanistan. As Afghanistan's condition is not stable as tribes present there, illiteracy as well there (Parenti, 2015). Afghanistan's history has been filled with wars and other bloody events, particularly during the international occupation, civil war that followed between insurgents' groups and the government, and an uprising after 1978, that lasts for thirty years. These events drag the country back in terms of development (Chen, 2011).

3.1 The Great Game of Afghanistan:

The great game, basically a term which explains the events of nineteenth century held between the Britain and Russia over the influence of Asia specifically Afghanistan. The actual story of Afghanistan started from the nineteenth century, when British occupied sub-continent, she also wanted to capture the bordering areas and Afghanistan was profitable for them. British wanted to use Afghanistan as a buffer zone and wanted to invade Afghanistan (Smith).

3.2 Anglo-Afghan Wars:

There were three wars that fought between the Britishers and Afghanistan. First Anglo-Afghan War which started in 1839 and ends in 1842 between the Britishers and Afghanistan. During the first war, the Afghani's were the strong fighters, the fight strongly as result they win the war and Britishers withdrawal from the fight. After the twenty to thirty years of first Anglo-Afghan war, the second war held again between them in which Britishers win the fight and captured some

part of Afghanistan. In 1919, third Anglo-Afghan war held in which British withdraw and Afghanistan wins diplomatically (Strausz-Hupe).

As Russia and Britishers both wanted to invade Afghanistan, ultimately British win. After the end of the World War-I, British left Afghanistan. Now Raja Maharaja ruled Afghanistan, the monarchy initiated in Afghanistan (Hauner, 2009).

3.3 After WWI: Afghanistan

King Zahir Shah forty years ruled in Afghanistan, and he ruled very neutrally, he didn't support west mush, supports in a sense means during World War one and two, he remained neutral, his policies were neutral and modernistic, he gave rights to the people. in 1973, Zahir Shah was overthrown. His cousin Dawood Khan who was prime minister during Zahir Shah rule, in his absence Dawood Shah overthrown him with the support of People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). PDPA doesn't mean that it's a democratic party, basically it's a communist or leftist party. PDPA basically established in 1965 because the condition of people was not good as well as 1960s was a period when in Middle East protests held everywhere even in Afghanistan, its founders were Noor Muhammad Tarakki, Barbak Kamal and Hafiz-Ullah Amin (Rubin, 1994).

There were two groups in Afghanistan, the first one is "Percham" which means flag basically they are nationalists and belongs to urban middle class, moderate faction and the other one was "Khalq" faction which means People, those who work for the people. In Afghanistan, newspaper published in the name of Percham and Khalq. Khalq faction supported by rurals and eight to ninety percent of people of Afghanistan lived in rural areas, not developed that's why

Afghanistan considered as worlds backward country where illiteracy present and even no land reforms present there. Soviet also supported Khalq Faction (Arnold, 1985).

As already discussed, that in 1973, Zahir Shah was overthrown and after him Dawood came in power with the support of People Democratic Party of Afghnaistan (PDPA), Soviet also supported Dawood regime. Dawood during his administration adapted the policy of “non-Alignment”. As the main aim of Afghanistan was to unite all the Puston’s but Dawood khan backed from his aim and wanted to introduce “Deformation”. As a result of this Soviet and PDPA turned against him because their agendas now different from each other. As a result of this, rivalry increases and PDPA and Dawood gradually became enemy of each other. In 1978, a prominent member of Percham Mir Akbar Khyber was murdered. Dawood khan proper planning involved behind this murder, as he came to know about the plan of PDPA wanted to eliminate him. As a result of this, PDPA members angry on him. After some days, Hafiz-Ullah Amin was put under house arrest. Noor Muhammad Tarakki was also under the house arrest. PDPA leaders murder planning came in front. After all these situations, PDPA decided to eliminate Dawood Khan from the administration. For this PDPA said army to surrender. Army accepted and they both came in one page and after this army raid on Dawoods home. PDPA now control the government, this is the time when monarchy ends in Afghanistan (Qayum, 2017).

First time Afghanistan became “The Republic of Afghanistan”. To overthrow Dawood, PDPA’s both factions joined hands together, but after his elimination against both factions separated from each other. At that time only sixteen percent people lived in urban areas. Afghanistan has rough terrain, roads are not developed, no industry present there, the infrastructure of Afghanistan is zero. There were some industries present in Kabul. When PDPA came in power

they started to initiate land reforms in which the non-urban land converted into urban land. Those people who have no land, they gave them land. PDPA started nationalization. They also gave rights to the women and spread education among the females too. In Afghanistan there was childhood marriage system, even love marriage nor allowed, when PDPA came in power, they changed all this. PDPA also worked on various educational, health, social, and agricultural reforms. They also developed proper water distribution system (Cramer, 2002).

As people of Afghanistan were not addicted to change, people did not like these reforms. Now, people stand against PDPA. For them, PDPA changed their values, cultural and traditional norms. AS Soviet supported PDPA because both are communists. Soviet helped PDPA in this situation and send their army properly in Afghanistan. After one year, again Percham and Khalq separated, power struggle between them again initiated.

Nur Muhammad Tarakki became the new President from the Khalq group, but he executed by Hafiz-ullah Amin. In 1979, Hafiz -Ullah Amin became the president. As Soviets didn't like him, he was murdered, and the new Pro-Soviet President Qamar Barbaad replaced him (Tejjeler, 2015).

3.4 Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan:

Soviet wanted peace in Afghanistan, during March 1979, Soviet send their troops in Afghanistan. Now, Soviet-Afghan War initiated. PDPA ruled in Afghanistan from 1979-1987. They did a lot of things in Afghanistan and wanted to do more but due to resistance from their public and as well as interference of other actors failed to do that. As majority of the people were against People Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) and Soviet because of this, US

took advantage of the situation and decided to have helped them against their government (Phillips J. , 1980).

The people who stand against their government called themselves as “Mujahedeen” supported by the US, Pakistan, and China. In 1989, Soviet evacuated their forces from Afghanistan. The civil war that followed between insurgents’ groups called the Mujahedeen and the USSR and PDPA lasted nine years, which further dragging the country back in terms of development. Mujahedeen win due to support of United States (David, 2000).

3.5 Operation Cyclone:

During 1981-1989, the Ronald Reagan was President of US during Soviet Afghan war. Operational Cyclone was basically initiated during the presidency of Jimmy Carter. Ronald Reagan increased funding in Soviet Afghan war to Mujahedeen. The basic purpose of operational Cyclone was to destruct the Soviet leadership in Afghanistan, On the other hand, Soviet tries to spread communism in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is rich in natural resources and every state has their personal interests in Afghanistan (Glad, 1991).

Reagan gave his doctrine in which he said, “We must stand by all our democratic allies. And we must not break faith with those who are risking their lives on every continent, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua, to defy Soviet-supported aggression and secure rights which have been ours from birth”.

Ronald Reagan foreign policy was based on the Roll back strategy from the 1950s in which US would actively push back the influence of the Soviet invasion. His administration focused much of its energy on supporting proxy enemies to curtail Soviet influence. To reduce the influence of Soviets, US gave training to one lac volunteers in Afghanistan US supported Afghanistan

economically well as militarily. Us supported Afghanistan with the help of Pakistan. CIA gave financial and military support to Pakistan, as a result Pakistan supplies to Afghanistan as Pakistan is the neighboring state of Afghanistan that's why it convenient for the US to reach Afghanistan via Pakistan. In all this scenario Pakistan play very important and direct role by giving the training to Mujahedeen. The Soviet was unable to fight the insurgency and withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989 (Busch, 1997).

3.6 Mujahedeen's and Afghanistan:

The day when Soviet left the Afghanistan was very prosperous day for every Afghani because they waited so long that the enemy to leave them alone. But soon they were locked and surrounded by a severe war. During the Soviet occupation the main capital of Afghanistan Kabul remained safe but the war in rural areas were very atrocious, people of rural areas faced killing, tormented by the communists and because of this violence many people from the rural areas left their places. As Soviet withdrawal from the Afghanistan but in Kabul there was still communist government led by the Doctor Najibullah who was the last communist president of Afghanistan (Westermann, 1997).

In 1991, the Soviet Union collapsed, their own economic condition worse as a result they stopped supporting Afghanistan. Now the Mujahideen goal was to captured Kabul. Ahmed Shah Masoud who was the Mujahedeen commander, under his leadership in 1992, Kabul captured by them and in this way the communist's period in Afghanistan was ended. Dr. Najibullah took refuge in Unite Nation compound camp. Afghan Mujahedeen happy from their victory but still the southern part of Afghanistan was captured by the other group, and tis group also wanted to gain power and control Afghanistan and the main leader of this faction was Gulbuddin Hekmatyar. He entered the Kabul and became prime minister on the other hand Masoud became

the defense minister. Both factions have many differences with each other. As both belongs to different ethnic group. In Afghanistan, there are many ethnic groups such as Uzbek, Hazara, Tajik, and Pashtun, in such type of multi-ethnic country, rivalries among the different factions added fuel to the fire (Ali ahmed Jalali, 1999).

As these two different factions supported by two different rival states India and Pakistan. Hekmetyar supported by Pakistan while Masoud supported by India. Both states did not want the rule of enemy in their border line. All factions received aid from abroad and Pakistanis particularly eager to influence ion Afghanistan Politics. Because Pakistan also wanted its pro-Pakistan government because there were millions of refugees from Afghanistan to Pakistan, hosting them on its land and the other important factor of involvement of Pakistan was India, India is enemy state of Pakistan and Pakistan not wanted pro-Indian government in Afghanistan who was against Pakistan because in this way, Pakistan western border as well insecure and strategic depth of Pakistan more reduced. that's why, Pakistan needed an ally government in Kabul (Grau, 2004).

3.7 Rise of Taliban:

In 1994, the new movement in Afghanistan was appeared with the name of “Taliban” which means that the student of Islam. This movement initiated when the clerics from the Kandahar me and they decide to restore order and peace in Afghanistan. With the passage of time, this movement strong it roots and grew faster. Taliban turned against the Mujahedeen and started movement against them. Taliban first action was to capture the rapist and hang him. Taliban choose Mulla Umer as their leader, who had fought against the Soviets during the Soviet Afghan war. People supported Taliban because they wanted peace, they get rid of war as Taliban promised them to restore peace (Behuria, 2007).

3.8 9/11 and Afghanistan:

The horrific events of September 11th shattered America to its very foundation. Possibly the world changed forever on that day. Even 23 years later, we can still feel the effects of this day in our daily lives. 9/11 has had a significant influence on people's lives. American Airlines Flight 11 departs from Boston's Logan International Airport bound for Los Angeles on September 11th. Approximately 92 individuals, including 81 passengers and 11 crew members, were aboard this aircraft. 15 minutes after takeoff, it finds out that 5 of the 81 people on board were hijackers. By dominating the passengers and pushing their way into the cockpit, the hijackers take control of the aircraft. One of them was Muhammad Atta, a pilot by training who was 33 years old and of Egyptian descent. He seizes control of the aircraft from the pilot and co-pilot and directs it directly towards the World Trade Centre (Li, 2010).

At one point, the World Trade Centre was the tallest building in the world and was a significant historical structure in America. The hijackers' collision with the North Tower of the World Trade Centre. When Andrew Card broke the news to George W. Bush while he was visiting a Florida school, Bush couldn't believe it and declared it impossible for anyone to have been able to do it. Bush also assumed the pilot had suffered a heart attack. After this attack lasted for 17 minutes, it was discovered that United Airlines Flight 175 had also been taken over by five hijackers.

Only 17 minutes after the initial accident, the hijackers turned again towards the World Trade Centre and crashed the plane into the South Tower. This time, the hijackers again were able to overpower the crew and seize control of the aircraft. George Bush had already arrived at the school and was already reading aloud to a group of 2nd graders in a classroom. America is under attack, said Chief of Staff Andrew Gadd as he entered the classroom and crooned into his

ear. After learning about the second attack, he remained in class for the next seven minutes, keeping busy with the kids. Bush received criticism for the delay. After a few minutes, two planes were hijacked once more, one of which was American Airlines flight 77, which had departed from Washington International Airport. The five hijackers were on board this flight headed for Los Angeles. United Airlines flight 93 was the second aircraft. the flight from California to New Jersey. It appears to have 4 hijackers. Both flights were redirected through the US capital of Washington, D.C. The Pentagon, the US Department of Defense's administrative center outside of Washington, D.C., is a famous structure that was struck by hijackers as they turned flight 77 in its direction (Ashraf, 2010).

The United States' entire air space was shut off after the incident. All flying aircraft were instructed to land at the closest airfield. Both the White House and the Capital Hill complex are likely candidates for the four-plane target. However, some of the passengers on this flight started talking on their phones while the plane was being hijacked. They began receiving calls from their relatives. Attacks by passengers on hijackers and a crash landing of the plane.

Overall, the attack resulted in three thousand deaths and six thousand injuries. Al-Qaida and Osama Bin Laden are thought to be behind this attack. nonetheless, Osama Bin Laden refutes. After three years of this attack, Osama confessed and provided a defense, stating that we were responsible for these attacks due to US involvement in the Muslim World and our mistreatment of Muslims. In May 2011, Osama Bin Laden was fatally shot. A hastily enacted PATRIOT ACT was made by the US Congress following the 9/11 attacks (B, 2007).

The measure hasn't even been read by some of the politicians that were in the US parliament. Act was simply passed; there was no discussion or revisions. This legislation provided the US

government unrestricted power, the ability to spy on its subjects, and the ability to access any books, records, papers, and documents in secret. They also diminished the judiciary's authority, and this act applied to everyone. People drew attention to the fact that the government essentially utilized the PATRIOT ACT and the threat posed by terrorists as justification to silence its dissenters. Translates to suggest that this act was utilized to silence those who spoke out against the administration. To justify these attacks, Osama Bin Laden called for American intervention in the Middle East. However, American intervention has increased since 9/11. Following 9/11, the United States invaded Afghanistan to hunt down this terrorist organization.

3.9 War on Terror and Role of Pakistan:

A crucial turning point in US-Pakistan ties occurred in 1979 when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. The intervention also created the groundwork for Pakistan to have a larger role in Afghan domestic affairs. The Inter-Services Intelligence Agency (ISI) of Pakistan organized numerous mujahedeen groups, primarily from the Pashtun tribal areas, with generous support from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). General Zia ul Haq, the military dictator of Pakistan, welcomed Afghan refugees into his country and became known as the "godfather" of the purported "Afghan jihad." Its extensive involvement by Pakistan has had negative and far-reaching effects. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, Pakistan joined hands with the Bush administration and participated in War on Terror. By detaining many of al-Qaeda's commanders and turning them over to the US, the Pakistani Army assisted the US in its efforts to target the terrorist organization. US assist Pakistan financially and militarily to eradicate terrorism (Nazir, 2010).

After the US raid that resulted in the death of Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad on May 2, 2011, ties between America and Pakistan deteriorated. Up until a US drone assault on May 22, 2016,

which killed Taliban leader Mullah Akhtar Mansoor in the region of Baluchistan, things seemed to be getting better through a rapprochement. Relations between the two nations now largely rest on Pakistan's capacity to work with the US to stabilize Afghanistan and stop the scourge of Islamic terrorism (Lahoud, 2021).

Barack Obama started talking about a new strategic direction in the US strategy for the Afghan conflict as soon as he was elected president in December 2008. He gave speech in which he said, we can't keep viewing Afghanistan separately, it's a regional issue that also effects Pakistan, India, and Iran. Nevertheless, the US strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan was one that served to symbolize the entire region. Former President Obama had hoped to alter the established American way of thinking. US helped Pakistan to combat terrorism. The Pakistani government will work more closely with the US to combat militants. The Obama administration tried several different approaches to balance US relations with Pakistan's civilian and military authorities. The Pakistani military engaged in operations against groups that carried out attacks inside Pakistan, according to the 2014 nation reports on terrorism from the US State Department. The commanders of the Afghan Taliban and Haqqani network continued to seek refuge in Pakistan, and while Pakistani military operations hindered their activities. At the Army Public School (APS) in Peshawar in December 2014, the Taliban carried out one of the bloodiest terror attacks in Pakistan, murdering 145 people, virtually all of whom were children. Following the incident in Peshawar, Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif met with the leaders of the US military, General John Campbell and Ashraf Ghani of Afghanistan to offer cooperation in battling and apprehending the Taliban commanders responsible for the atrocity.

Obama understood that effective cooperation with Pakistan was crucial for long-term stability and efforts to support a workable reconciliation process to put an end to the conflict in

Afghanistan. There were signs that the Taliban could start negotiations to end the conflict when Pakistan and Afghanistan began to have closer relations after President Ghani took office. Such optimism, however, were short-lived as the Afghan Taliban kept carrying out risky assaults. In particular, the Taliban carried out a brutal assault on Kunduz in October 2015, momentarily gaining control of the jail and airport as the administration of President Ghani finished its first year in office (Ashley, 2017).

The American troops in Afghanistan found itself in a desperate challenge because of having to get involved beyond just performing their designated mission of advising and training Afghan security forces. Over the course of four days, the US responded by conducting airstrikes to retake Kunduz. President Obama made the decision to postpone the departure of American troops from Afghanistan on October 15. realizing that security had not significantly improved and that the Afghan security forces lacked the strength to successfully defeat the Taliban, Obama made the announcement that 8,400 troops would stay in Afghanistan through 2016 during the first week of July, leaving choices about the withdrawal date to the incoming administration. Over twenty percent of Kabul was under Taliban influence by the end of the third month of 2017 and the number of fatalities multiplied. Vital government agencies as well as structures such as the supreme the legal system, the legislature property, political zone, armed forces, and law enforcement buildings, also became desires of violent incidents (Huston, 2017).

3.10 Aftermath of 9/11 on Pakistan:

In the consequences of 9/11 attack, there is instability and unrest in Afghanistan. The 9/11 attack not only effects the Afghanistan but as well as it created the regional instability. In the years after the US invasion of Afghanistan, there was a significant influx of Afghan refugees into Pakistan as well as a rapid increase in the number and size of terrorist strikes in Pakistan.

The combined effect of these changes had a negative effect on the rate of total economic growth across all significant economic sectors. Due to these circumstances and several other factors, Pakistan continues to pay a high price both economically and in terms of security (Johnson, 2008).

Over the past few years, a sizeable percentage of the nation's limited human and material resources have been redirected to deal with the increasing security issues. Because of the unrest in Afghanistan, there has been an increase in terrorism and violent extremism in Pakistan, which has not only done significant harm to Pakistan's economy as well as accountable for widespread human suffering. These circumstances interfered with Pakistani's regular economic and trading, raising company expenses and causing interruptions in manufacturing processes as a result, that make it difficult to fulfil international export demands. Due to this, Pakistani goods have consequently slowly lost market share to other items. As a result, economic development slowed, import demand decreased, tax revenue decreased, and foreign investment influxes decreased (Omrani, 2010).

The problems of the declining performance of the export-oriented industry have been made worse by the outflow of investment and harmful tendencies in capital outsourcing in Pakistan. A total of US\$ 102.51 billion, or Rs. 102.51 trillion, was spent by Pakistan in direct and indirect costs over the past 13 years because of terrorist attacks. Pakistan needs plenty of funds to repair her deteriorating infrastructure, enhance the commercial conditions, and increase economic productivity. Islamabad captured a lot of Al-Qaeda militants and offered more information and military assistance compared to the rest of the partnership in the fight towards terrorists. In addition, Islamabad has incurred much more losses in the fight with extremism compared to the entire Global Nations fatalities of the alliance troops from forty-one nations in Kabul. Despite

the country's heroic achievements in resolving this issue, the United States of America, worries about the nation's commitment and capacity to combat terrorist attacks keep damaging ties between the two partners. Under the prevailing situation, Islamabad isn't as alleviated about its function was the day before September 11, when it played a crucial bridge connecting Western nations and Kabul. Islamabad is also concerned regarding growing Delhi involvement in Kabul. Pakistan could scarcely tolerate her rival state interference, the existence of any kind of alien powers within its neighborhood due to internal conditions plus safety worries. Islamabad is thus extremely concerned by her enemy state's increasing involvement in Kabul, notably with the opening of a large network of embassies in Afghanistan (Goodson, 2014).

The embassies may be associated with unbearable activities, according to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The detention of well-known Indian Intelligence spy Jadhav is one example of, how the country suspects such embassies are assisting violence in Islamabad, extending Delhi contribution, and inflaming Islamabad's negative propaganda in various provinces of Pakistan. Maintaining an unrestricted involvement of Delhi within Kabul, involves betraying Islamabad. Pakistan frequently asserts that it supports the United States and her partners' goals in Kabul and that it's dedicated to creating a secure and peaceful Kabul. Islamabad is sole nation that may gain the greatest advantage from Kabul's peace. Her involvement with ongoing insurgency appears like it has concluded the loop. The political establishment of Islamabad is against a total pullout of American along with coalition soldiers. This demonstrates a shift in thinking in Islamabad, where authorities previously blamed the rise in terrorism in Islamabad is because of the deployment of North Atlantic Treaty Organizations (NATO) soldiers in Afghanistan. Her establishment considers that as Kabul hasn't fully settled down, our country would yet again experience the fallout from the evacuation of American and coalition

soldiers from that country. The effects of an American pullout would be worse compared to those of a USSR evacuation. An encouraging trend is the expansion of American and partner forces in Kabul (Larry, 2014).

A distinct inquiry is necessary to evaluate this recent change. Yet, it is widely believed that the United States will no longer focus on Kabul and would instead turn her focus to other emerging problems in the region of the Middle Eastern and East Asian countries. The risks to American defense comprise Beijing growing power in the waters of the East and South China Seas, Moscow's regaining control of Crimea, threats from the Republic of Korea, and the threat posed by Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS's) to American goals in the Middle East. The United States' role in Kabul is expected to be impacted by problems within the region including the Middle East, Asia-Pacific, and Crimea.

On the twenty-second of August, the US leadership under the presidency of Donald Trump, made his eagerly anticipated Afghan strategy announcement. Trump increased the American military's involvement in Kabul, pleaded with Delhi for assistance, blamed Islamabad for accommodate extremists, and warned that US would end the entire financial assistance unless Islamabad wasn't doing greater to halt the influx of terrorism towards Kabul. United States of America also argued that secret activities targeting terrorism within Islamabad may rise, which Pakistani authorities took seriously (Morgan, 2007).

Chapter 4

4. Trump Policy Towards Afghanistan

When US President Donald Trump came in power, he made several policies at domestic as well as international level. On August 21, 2017, he gave a speech in which he highlighted his ‘America First’ policy, in which he stated that from this time to onward our main priority is our own state (Ettinger, 2018). This revisionist policies of US gave a new strategical framework for India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. In his inauguration speech, he also shared his strategy towards Afghan war in the wider perspective of US relation with Pakistan and India. The declaration of Trump strategy towards Afghanistan has significance impact on Pakistan because Pakistan is the major ally of US but by announcing his new approach towards Afghanistan shows a shift in US relation from Pakistan to its adversary India. As in the past, the US administration under the George W. Bush also criticize Pakistan for her poor performance in fighting Taliban’s as they successfully overthrown the Afghan Government and takeover Afghanistan. On the other hand, US appreciated India for its efforts to spread peace in the region by working on developing projects in Afghanistan.

As the Trump statement regarding Pakistan is very harsh and even, they neglect the role of Pakistan in Afghanistan. US is the sole superpower, and she must maintain good relationship with Pakistan specially in the context of Afghanistan. In this way the law-and-order situation remain in the South Asian region (James Griffiths, 2017).

4.1 Trump and Afghanistan:

When Trump came in power, he announces his strategy that is purely for his own state. In his inauguration speech he declares his plan for the Afghanistan and gave his remarks for Pakistan’s

role in combating terrorism. According to him, Pakistan's role is not appreciated in the context of Afghanistan. He planned for the Afghanistan and his main points of his strategy are as under, He gave American First Policy and he decided to withdrawal of all American Troops from the Afghanistan as she succeeded in toppling of the Mula Umer government and the main accused of the 9/11 attack. During the Trump era US have invested billions of Dollars in equipping Afghan Army with the modern military machinery. Therefore, Trump's policy resulted in complete reversal of the Obama's policy as it is unfathomable to remain in Afghanistan after investing in Afghan Army and in their political process.

Trump more focus on countering terrorism than showing up Afghan government that could mean an increased focus on Pakistan. Trump hasn't said a lot about Afghanistan during the campaign or after the election but what he said about the region he makes a sound like he is primarily interested in strategic problems related to Pakistan (Charles, 2022).

4.2 Trump's New Approach:

As Trump previously said he withdrawal all the troops from Afghanistan but soon, he announced that, if US withdrawal all the troops from the Afghanistan as a result the terrorists again gain a a strong hold in Afghanistan. Therefore, US increase number of troops in Afghanistan as there were already 8,400 troops present there. President trump did not share the exact number of increasing US troops.

The second and most important statement of President Trump was that he put force on all the bordering states of Afghanistan specifically Pakistan to sort out the issue. As Pakistan is the neighboring state of Afghanistan so she has a central role in Afghan peace process, and she can

assist US in negotiation with the Taliban. According to him, Pakistan supports Taliban and he warn Pakistan to stop assisting the terrorists' group (Raza, 2017).

4.3 Trump Policy deviates from the Previous Administration:

As there is shift in Trump policy as compared to Obama's policy. During Obama's administration, he clearly shared the exact numbers of troops, but Trump reverse this policy and not share the exact number of increasing troops. Obama not only shared the exact figures of deployed troops, but as well as shared all the details regarding the removing of troops from Afghanistan (Reuter, 2009). Trump decided to post the US troops in Afghanistan until all the terrorist's groups and other factions such as Al-Qaida and Daesh to stop them to topple the Afghan government. Trump discussed "the merging of all policy elements of American power, soft and hard power in order to achieve our goal in his policy speech. It was claimed that discussions with the Taliban was a possibility. But Trump prioritized helping Afghanistan's government "as they face the Taliban. The Obama administration also tried to start discussions with the Taliban (DeYoung, 2013). Though, the Trump looks to be taking a step-by-step strategy, first establishing a favorable environment for discussions then opening the lines of communication. Trump's repeated assertion that America is not in Afghanistan "to construct an entire country" suggested that Us will not be controlling Afghan policy but rather acting "merely as a mediator. This indicates that to allow the Afghan government to rule without violence, the priority was on "countering the Taliban. It is just another sign that Trump has diverted from Obama's approach that the US will prioritize aiding the Afghan government in its conflict with the Taliban. The other important thing in Trump policy is, his statement towards Pakistan that, the Taliban and other organizations that represent a threat to the United States have safe havens in Pakistan and we cannot continue to remain quite about this. President

Trump in his talks threat to punish Pakistan for retaining terrorists who involved in killing of US military official and Afghan locals. Trump criticism against Pakistan is not now for example during the Obama administration, listed "to impede, disassemble, and eliminate al-Qaeda and its safe places in Pakistan, and to prevent their return to Pakistan or Afghanistan" as one of his strategy's primary objectives in his 2009 policy review (Baruah, 2009).

Osama bin Laden, the mastermind of the September 11, 2001, attacks on the Pentagon in northern Virginia and the World Trade Centre in New York, was found to be hiding in Pakistan in 2010. After the 2011 attack US defense support to Pakistan significantly decreased. Yearly financial and safety support reached a high of more than \$3.5 billion in 2011, but by 2014, it had decreased to no more than \$1 billion. This finding led to his death by US Navy SEALs in May 2011. US generate a fund known as Coalition Support Fund (CSF) which give financial assistance to Pakistan to assist US in War on Terror. More than \$14 billion has been returned to Pakistan by the CSF since 2002. President Trump also said in December 2017, that the status Pakistan has played being an essential non-NATO alliance member according to the war towards terrorists was reportedly in risk, and he announced that the nation would suspend an additional \$255 million in assistance from the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) programs.

According to Obama, Pakistan play a twofold game and he warned Pakistan to support the dismantling of safe havens to continue receiving support from the United States as it will not be "supplying an empty check to Pakistan". Trump expressed the same idea, but he went one step farther by formally urging India to play a significant role in Afghanistan. This effectively overlooked Pakistan's main objections about India's participation in Afghanistan (Landler, 2016).

Trump criticism towards by Pakistan:

Trump's new plan for Pakistan is a crucial component of his plans for Afghanistan. The outspoken criticism served as obvious evidence of the US dissatisfaction with Pakistan's twin strategy in Afghanistan. Trump's "restricted" solidarity with Pakistan, which is subject on the country taking decisive and trustworthy measures to combat terrorist acts in this zone, would undoubtedly bring Pakistan nearer to China and Russia. Trump's action has alarmed Pakistan, especially considering the projected expansion in India's involvement in Afghan issues. As the legislature passed a bill arguing against "intolerant along with aggressive" remarks delivered by Trump's administration while stating his current strategy, it showed its unhappiness. The comparable decisions encouraged the Pakistani government to take several measures to lessen the effects caused by the "The United States Shift," including starting "diplomatic drive, especially among alliance states in the neighborhood, to let them know that of the country's combating terrorism approach as well as accomplishments and the ramifications about dissolved American actions within the area (Ateeq, 2017).

The signs are unmistakable as Islamabad is looking to establish fresh alliances in the area to mitigate any potential negative effects of its worsening relations with the US. In these calculations, the economies of China and Russia would play a significant role. The two countries have pledged their geopolitical assistance to Islamabad considering potential American strikes. That highlights the basic query of how much influence America is going to be capable to exert on Pakistan given its expanding ties to China and Russia (Khuldune, 2018). Because Islamabad is not motivated to alter its trajectory, it is relevant to worry that Trump's warnings to Pakistan may not have any positive effects for the goals of the US. Additionally, Pakistan will become vigilant and search for negotiating possibilities with China as Trump

pushes for India to become proactive in the area. Regarding this, China seems to benefit strategically from Trump's approach.

4.4 Trump Inclination towards India:

It has also been going on for centuries that the United States prefers Delhi over Islamabad as their main partner in Indian subcontinent. But the growth of India in American international affairs appears to be a considerable departure from earlier times. As per Indian officials, America's acknowledgement in Delhi's crucial contribution to the restoration and maintenance of tranquilly in Afghanistan is the US's most significant turn in the nation's support to far. Earlier American governments acknowledged Indian contribution to the conflict in Afghanistan but refrained from planning for a significant Indian participation out of concern about upsetting Pakistan. Delhi reacted immediately to President Donald Trump's latest Afghanistan plans, praising the will power to step up measures to address issues of hiding places as well as additional types of overseas assistance received by extremist in Afghanistan. President Donald Trump's focus on terrorist activities and the Pakistani government visible complicity regarding it, proved to be geopolitical plus for India (Parpiani, 2018).

Yet, the new approach offered additional advantages for India. Trump's abrupt withdrawal from this issue is of vital importance along with two important ramifications over Delhi, the first is, that has become obvious that Pakistan is no longer a major factor in US strategy, and the US is prepared to support a greater Indian presence in Afghanistan and the other important ramification is that India is able to plan to obtain a greater comprehensive involvement alongside the United States of America, especially regarding Afghanistan, in order to confront Pakistan through gaining the required strength. Several main phases may be used to analyze India's engagement in Afghanistan during America's presence. The initial phase, began with the

Bonn conference, when India's significant contribution was acknowledged. India was more excluded by the United States in the following stage, which started in 2007 because of Pakistan's unhappiness. Because of Trump's new approach, Washington has come to understand India's crucial role and is now prepared to embrace it, dispelling Pakistan's concerns (Bouton, 2017).

As President Donald Trump inclined towards India as a result the inclination of China and Russia is towards Pakistan, which is something worrying for India. New Delhi engagement increases in Afghanistan after the Trump new policy, the Indian Prime Minister made a strategy to engaged India in Afghanistan for this, he offered a million dollars in new assistance to Afghanistan when the Afghanistan President visited, signaling how much India eager for the growth of relations among each of the states. The administration has increased protection by giving Afghanistan combat aircraft, a move that clearly infuriated Pakistan. Delhi also has thoughts about agreeing to fix Afghanistan's planes and buy weapons from them (Tellis, 2020).

4.5 Why Trump's so harsh towards Pakistan:

The White House stated harsh about Islamabad in the beginning stages of the administration of Donald Trump, promising to exert greater force to persuade Islamabad to act against the terrorist organizations operating there that pose a risk and attack American objectives as well as forces within Afghanistan. In his first tweet of the year, President Trump lashed out against Pakistan, saying:

"They have given us nothing but lies & deception, thinking our leaders are idiots.... No more!"

The American administration force Pakistan by various ways such as escalating airstrikes against Pakistan and removing Pakistan from the list of important non-NATO countries. Its termination of Pakistani military support in the fall of 2017 became one of its rare disciplinary measures. Yet the situation is not unique, America previously decreased Pakistan's economic support, most notably as the nineties in reaction to the country's creation of nuclear warheads. The current administration additionally imposed fresh limitations on the travel of Pakistani ambassadors stationed inside the country, however the restrictions mostly followed repeated American concerns regarding the mistreatment of US officials within Islamabad. The Trump administration also discontinued its security cooperation and academic cooperation initiative for Islamabad (Kugelman, 2019).

As Trump harsh statements against Pakistan be like a childish because American administration knows that if US applied harsh measure against the Pakistan as result of this, Pakistan cutoff transportation channels within her territory utilized for carrying supplies to American and other Coalition troops in Afghanistan. In the past, Pakistan cutoff the American troops routes in year 2011 because she lost her 24 soldiers due to the NATO airstrikes along the border side of Pakistan. American Administrator of the State, Hillary Clinton made a public reparation over the event, Pakistan remained the roads blocked over a period of 7 months.

Pakistan in search for New Partners:

To offset the strong links between the Washington and Delhi and safeguard its financial as well as military objectives, Islamabad is encouraged by the easing of tensions towards the United States to look for fresh as well as enhance current alliances among regional countries. Beijing is Islamabad's potential partner in creating an alternative equilibrium in the area. In the immediate

aftermath of Donald Trump's address in 2017, Beijing defended Islamabad, claiming that Islamabad is leading the battle against terrorism. Pakistan and China have launched a project known as One Belt and One Road (OBOR), in which Pakistan is a significant partner of China. Both States have a relationship that it refers to strong allies of each other. Islamabad now relies more on Beijing than the America for technologically advanced ammunition. Beijing is currently Islamabad's top arms supplier (Masood, 2021). Islamabad additionally asked for assistance from Riyadh, Tehran, Ankara, and Moscow. In exchange of assisting Islamabad gain complete status in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Moscow eased its ban on the transfer of armaments to that country. Additionally, since Moscow has prohibited the purchase of agricultural products from the European Union, it is looking at purchasing them from Islamabad (Bhatti, 2018).

4.6 China's Reaction towards Trump harsh argument on Pakistan:

China's intentions and approach to Afghanistan has shifted significantly in recent years, and they now combine regional issues about radicalization with their geopolitical goals in Afghanistan. Except that it is the former that appears to be driving China strategy towards the area, as Pakistan's participation is crucial. Although they hold a fear about radicalization, China is attempting to combat the problem by establishing connections through the Taliban. Beijing additionally tried on a personal basis to establish an adequate characteristic to protect its objectives in Afghanistan, via numerous geographic, and global platforms to carry out these activities (Markey, 2020). China has further spent in Afghanistan through major mineral exploration endeavors, a few of that are apparently backed via Taliban. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), the Quadrilateral Coordination Group (QCG), which consists of

Afghanistan, Pakistan, the United States, and China, and the Quadrilateral Cooperation and Coordination Mechanism (QCCM), which consists of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, and China, are some of these. As a result, China is currently laboring independently using a variety of techniques, a few of which were started by China itself, like QCH, to gradually raise its presence throughout the area, rather than just in Afghanistan. When it comes to tackling the problem of terrorist activity, China has ignored the Pakistani government hidden backing for it and instead has gone out strongly in front of its friend. In the case of following the US's killing of Osama bin Laden, China publicly backed Islamabad (Andrew, 2020). Additionally, China consistently obstructed India's efforts to include terrorists located in Pakistan on UN blacklists. China publicly endorsed Pakistan in reaction to Trump's condemnation of that country, claiming that Pakistan is on leading ranks of combating terrorist activity, has made sacrifices in eliminating extremism, and has added significantly to maintaining harmony and prosperity. Pakistan will undoubtedly continue to be essential to China given its involvement in the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). Hence, it apparent that Beijing's security concerns in Afghanistan exceed its internal worries, and President Donald Trump's unilateral move gives China a way to step up its diplomatic efforts. It seems doubtful that China will try to modify its approach towards Pakistan given the dynamics for the relationship among both countries and the value of Pakistan being a geopolitical balance on India within that area. Because Pakistan is completely backed by China, it has become tough to feed America to exert significant force towards it (Daniel, 2020).

4.7 Russian response towards Trump harsh statement against Pakistan:

During inaugural speech, American President Trump, blamed Pakistan for illegally aiding as well as protecting jihadists. Islamabad restating Pakistan's position and respond to US President

Trump that she has no such shelters of jihadist present within her borders. The number of other states appreciated Pakistan on her hard work as well as her successful role in combating terrorism and they denied US harsh statement towards her. Russia and China, the two important allies of Pakistan respond to Trump harsh statement against Pakistan and they both said that Pakistan has important position in the global arena (Wajahat, 2018).

In the region, Russia had previously provided Pakistan with a large amount of political and defensive assistance. Moscow expressed support for Islamabad. Trump's Pakistan plan was criticized by the Russian Special Ambassador to Kabul, who emphasized on the fact that Pakistan remains a crucial international participant for dealing the terrorists, increasing influence on Islamabad could possibly strongly undermine the regional stability and have a detrimental impact on Kabul. Trump's comment was made for several reasons, among which was to offset the developing ties between Moscow and Islamabad as well as Moscow's dominance within her area. In the last few decades, both fierce foes from the period known as the Cold War have been successfully able to place bilateral disagreements behind as well increase their political, defensive, and financial collaboration. US President plan gave the impulsion in improving relations among the Moscow and Islamabad. Without a question, Washington and Islamabad ties have been overshadowed by Trump's Pakistan agenda. Presently, Pakistan will actively pursue closer connections with Moscow, and recent events seem to indicate that Moscow is leaning towards Pakistan (Blank, 2017). The region around India is more likely to be influenced by Moscow. Since the bigger American armament supply towards Delhi has overshadowed the ties between India and Moscow, Russia might have to explore for additional locations for the trade of both her oil as well arms supplies. Islamabad is thus Moscow's greatest choice to increase her presence in the Asian continent, after the

US president's policy. To expand strategic and commercial collaboration, especially regarding the oil and gas market, Islamabad is now expected to increase its ties to Moscow. Beyond the financial advantages, Moscow sees Islamabad as a significant neighbor as well as a key player in the peace initiative in Kabul. The above developments have been made possible by the leadership of Donald Trump. Additional aspects which reduce the gap between the two nations shouldn't be ignored as well. Moscow has clearly become vigilant in its interactions towards Islamabad because of the additional restrictions placed on it following her occupation of Ukrainians. The situation in Ukraine allowed Moscow to investigate alternate exports for gas as well as military. In this situation, Islamabad may represent an important supplier to feed Moscow for such fields. The unfortunate current situation among the United States of America and Islamabad might also be expected to cause a deeper change in global ties. The strong military relations between Delhi and the United States of America can promote Moscow to move closer to Islamabad. Along with enhancing their bilateral relations, Islamabad and Moscow are also starting to deepen their commercial and financial ties since continues to be significant space for progress in such areas. Pakistan's President Zardari on his trip towards Russia on, clear that the manufacturing capability that existed at Islamabad Iron Factories could increase, and in the month of February 2013 both parties signed a Memorandum of Understanding on development as well as upgrading of the Islamabad Iron Manufacturing. It appears evident that closer commercial as well as strategic relations between the two nations would benefit both parties. The development of commerce, power, and technology all have enormous scope. Given the shifting dynamics of ties with the US and the restricted political decisions alongside the current government in United States of America, that behaves oddly against Islamabad, that Islamabad's ultimate interest to continue to maintain strong ties among

every one of the major regional countries, particularly Moscow. Russia is unlikely to be able to overlook the growing dangers posed by different extremist organizations in Kabul given the growing interdependence between Islamabad's and Russia's counterterrorism concerns. The shortcomings of the United States troops in Kabul have been exposed by Trump's peace strategy towards Kabul. Islamabad could have a crucial part in Afghanistan in this respect, that might help Moscow to confront the new challenges. As a result, Islamabad should firmly pursue its most recent partnership with Moscow and maintain its separation from its alliances with other nations (Babar, 2018).

4.8 Pakistan-Iran Stance on Afghanistan:

The two countries Pakistan and Iran weren't in touch frequently regarding the Afghan crisis when the Taliban government were overthrown, particularly after the United States recognized Islamabad as being a non-NATO partner. Iranians harbored hatred against Islamabad for carrying out United States orders in Kabul. Iran additionally acknowledged that once the United States of America occupied Kabul and approached the Iranian frontiers, their support for the Taliban caused even more damage to her objectives in that country. Iran became essentially cornered by the US from both sides, following the Washington initiate a battle on Iraq. Eventually on, Iran proved out to benefit from the US invasion in Iraq. Iran, though, was concerned now that Islamabad may succumb to United States influence as well (Takeyh, 2021). Both countries are in favor of the reconciliation and security in Afghanistan within the diplomatic relationship. Both governments Iran and Pakistan began holding talks between themselves over the Afghan issue on the Secretary meetings of each of their Cabinet Ministries in 2017. At that point, it had been evident that Kabul was escalating into more turmoil as the Taliban seized more power. Both nations have formed mutual goals for Afghanistan such as

regarding the return of Afghan refugees back to their nation, but they haven't acquired a unified stance on governmental activities within the Kabul. As a member of the agreement reached by Kabul's closest borders to make the choices collaboratively on the Taliban regime's recognition, Islamabad and Tehran have participated. In the distant past of the area, this has never happened before. On a discussion conducted by the British Broadcasting (BBC) Imran Khan, Pakistan's prime minister, recalled the Tashkent agreement, that, in a manner, possibly paved the path for a future neighborhood agreement on Afghanistan. This accord could serve as a sign of a strong geographical coalition of Kabul's bordering states emerging in the future (Durrani, 2022).

Chapter 5

Pakistan's Response towards Trump Policy

Within reality, the US leadership under the president Donald Trump address lacked a sense of fairness. It overlooks Pakistani perspective and represents the viewpoints and objectives of the Washington and Delhi. The National Security Committee (NSC), the ministers, and finally the parliament of the country denounced the new Indian-subcontinent strategy of the Trump presidency. The Pak-government outlined several factors that the approach ignores. Such as Islamabad invested more money on the battle against terrorism probably every other country in the Asian region, and it paid huge costs in the process. According to Commander of United States, Nicholson, Islamabad doesn't shelter the terrorists, and neither her north nor southwest provinces have a terrorist's consultations. Many violent fractions, openly conduct operations targeting Islamabad through Kabul's territory. To undermine the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, her rival state India has a history of supporting terrorist organizations, such as she's supporting Baloch separatist movement. Although Islamabad isn't to blame for the Washington's inability to put an end to the terrorism in Kabul, this nation will remain unstable as long as United States soldiers remain there. The Kabul issue cannot be resolved militarily. The US leadership under Donald Trump planning in increasing the number of American troops in Kabul is to uphold US global supremacy (Aziz, 2018).

Because of Islamabad's governmental, financial, strategic, and foreign reliance on the United States of America as well as Delhi political replacement, Pakistan acted efficiently and favorably to the American intention to strike following the events of September 11, 2001. Another factor in the rapid adaptation of United States Policy was the unconstitutional regime of Gen. Pervez Musharraf, which sought global approval and assistance. Once accepted, the

issue of independence and human rights did not come up in the United States or the Western world for the following ten years, especially when Islamabad served as an immediate country fighting the conflict on Terrorism.

As an active nation in the war against terrorism, Islamabad played a significant role and contributed significantly to Operation Enduring Freedom, launched by United States of America to eliminate terrorism. Pakistan support Washington forces through permitting US troops to utilize installations and harbors, exchanging sensitive data, and apprehending key terrorist figures. Over 100,000 members of Islamabad's professional Corps were sent to guard the Pakistan and Afghanistan frontier. Pakistan undoubtedly played a role in the swift fall of the Afghanistan Taliban administration.

Nevertheless, Islamabad sacrificed greatly because of its involvement in the Global War on Terrorism. The expansion of the financial sector was essentially blocked by violent activities targeting army troops along with citizens. The societal framework that makes up Pakistan was destroyed by terrorist's beliefs, offensive language as well as actions, and the entire nation continues to convey the impression of being in a post-war wasteland.

The country's strategy towards Kabul's rebuilding relied upon an innovative strategy. Islamabad demonstrated its desire for an Afghanistan that is secure and prosperous by supporting every global effort in this direction. The attempts Islamic Republic made at that time to guarantee an imminent anti-Indian administration in Afghanistan, however, had a mixed response. Much of that period, the country's defenses against the allegations proved reasonable as well as sensible. The international affairs department of Islamabad often claimed the nation's budget wasn't sufficient for it to assist Kabul in the same way that other major powers could.

Notwithstanding numerous nation's issues, Islamabad agreed upon the thirty million Afghanistan's displaced person as well as also working to stabilize Kabul. The foreign Office officially stance on the matter that makes sense rationally sufficient to acknowledge the country's inability to finance a second enmity, lengthy frontier on the western side given the already existing border in the Eastern direction. A lot of researchers and professionals in the United States of America, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, in addition to other nations and platforms have questioned Islamabad's response to unmanned aircraft strikes (drone), which is a somewhat complicated political and strategic matter. Despite delving into radical opinions on unmanned aerial vehicles, it is evident that while the Islamabad state leadership agreed with them, it was not yet willing to recognize them openly because of concern for an increased extreme reaction from violent organizations present within the state. The protocol worked out quite well since it prevented the United States from using the unmanned aircraft to target shared adversaries and collected information via Islamabad. But the nation of Pakistan, just as the rest of countries in the neighborhood, fought to preserve her fundamental objectives as Washington started expanding her ambitions in the area and desired to achieve greater financial along with international influence.

Islamabad felt extremely uneasy with the unilaterally deployment of drones by the United States at that time, which mostly overlapped with the rehabilitation of Kabul. Islamabad now gains from its former stated position on unmanned aerial vehicles. Drones have been criticized as primarily American activities that violated the Islamabad sovereignty. Additionally, it had been emphasized that unmanned aerial vehicles cause non-combatants fatalities, a fact that has widely been acknowledged though it has never been brought up in global fora. while at that time, the deployment of drone was

being criticized internationally in terms of its authorized, ethical, and tactical justifications. This issue, which is still popular in academics, took a new shift after the country's leadership once more asked the United States for help using drones to strike certain challenging hiding places and eliminate shared foes for a peaceful finish to the War on Terror. Yet, in a latest guideline, Islamabad's foreign department referred to drone strikes within the states boundaries as a breach of the nation's integrity.

Both states Pakistan and the United States of America relations took an unexpected shift after Osama bin Laden was present, found, and ultimately assassinated by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) on Pakistani soil. The world leadership debated the country's precise involvement in the fight against terrorism. Within a country of Pakistan, the soldiers were questioned on their inability to stop a more than hours aerial strike in Pakistan. This incident brought both nation's Washington and Islamabad ties to a standstill. International circumstances and domestic priorities, though, compelled the two nations to cooperate for a minimum of a few more years. The main reason for this move was a thorough investigation by Pakistani authorities who found that the repercussions of fighting with the terrorism greatly outweigh its advantages. The involvement of Pakistan with the United States in the Taliban negotiations was a striking step towards that strategy's course. It demonstrated that Islamabad supports any effort and conciliatory measures that benefit Pakistan and aid in the installation of an Afghan government that is secure, tranquil, and supportive to Islamabad (Khalid, 2017).

Chapter 6

6. Trump Afghan policy's Implications for Pakistan

The election of Donald Trump becoming the new leader of the United States triggered various concerns regarding the direction that ties between Pakistan and the United States might advance during the presidency of Donald Trump. As can be seen from his prior speech, experts, decision-makers, and people at large have doubts regarding the new Trump attitude on Islamabad. Because of the circumstances in the area, Trump strategy hasn't been evenly fair in the past few years, so it is important to emphasize that the United States has recently tended to favor Islamabad's main opponent, New Delhi. Additionally, the growth of Beijing as well as the situation in Kabul are likely to have a dramatic impact on ties among both nations. Via these lenses, a less friendly Islamabad, President Trump would look at Pakistan as well as alter its long-term goals to this region of the globe. Financial support to Islamabad and the fight against terrorism efforts are going to be continuously evaluated. Trump heated grew over Islamabad's involvement in Kabul. The presidency of Donald Trump expressed mistrust for the country's armed services also claimed that its forces help in retaining extremists who were engaged in violent actions and unstable Kabul. It is anticipated that the "do more" movement will gain more momentum under a US president Donald Trump leadership. The probable result for Islamabad if the Donald Trump administration chooses to marginalize it, might be one of severe marginalization, however a complete disconnection isn't possible given Islamabad's geostrategic position. The new inauguration of the President Donald Trump government is taken into consideration as this study seeks to examine any potential consequences towards Islamabad (Akram, 2017).

The United States of America and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan ties is frequently characterized as unpredictable, receptive, and based on their interests. Due to the circumstances in the area, the ties among both states have frequently conditioned and faded. Restrictions on Islamabad have occasionally been implemented by succeeding United States governments, marking a difficult era in the two countries' enduring partnership. The Soviet-led occupation of Kabul in 1979 and the 9/11 atrocities on the United States are just two instances of how global events have significantly influenced the dynamics of the partnership that exists between Washington and Islamabad. This became essential to work with Islamabad because without it, it would have been intrinsically challenging for the United States to advance its goals. This is because the America has been dragged into the South Asian theatre of battle. In the contrary, the element of uncertainty in United States-Pakistani ties will continue to be dominant.

During a Trump government, the America's geopolitics goals will probably stay unchanged, making New Delhi its preferred ally in the area and the relationship between the two countries going to more strengthen. America will probably continue to be involved in the area due to China's financial potential and the China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). In this sense, controlling Beijing is the key element that will help to maintain United States interest in the area. Hence, it has become crucial for Islamabad to interact with the Trump government and develop connections to deepen the relationship. It appears like Islamabad would rank relatively restricted on America's attention level based on the latest news coverage and declarations made by the United States President Donald Trump. Yet, any unforeseen incident in the area might result in a resurgence of Washington concern for Islamabad. Partnerships are expected to keep

going, albeit on a critically low point. Relations among both nations have mostly focused on safety.

Yet it should be emphasized that based on prior speech, it remains readily apparent that the president of US Donald trump tilt towards New Delhi, and Islamabad needs to exercise precautionary measures, given his preference towards the country's enemy state. Trump's military consultant, believed that Islamabad must be penalized because of her ties to extremist militants, statements by his staff have also indicated a harsh stance against that country. Islamabad is unable to speculate on the future direction of this partnership at this point. Previously said, President Donald Trump's inclination for New Delhi might be considered a key element in determining how the future United State government would treat Pakistan. The emerging circumstance in Kabul is going to impact Islamabad's safety. The difficulties facing by her may increase if Afghanistan is unrest, whereas Islamabad will benefit from tranquility and prosperity in Kabul. Given the situation, it is essential that Islamabad's leadership be ready for any unforeseen circumstance and avoid falling off guard such as they were when international forces departed from Kabul in the past (Tughral, 2021).

The United States President Donald trump policy towards Afghanistan has various implication for Pakistan.

6.1 A weak Neighbor: Threat to Pakistan.

The Islamabad policy makers fears that the Afghan new government, comprises of Taliban administration lacks global trust and the associated financial advantages from the Kabul might quickly turn into an issue rather a benefit. Although the Islamic faction have taken control of the country, the United States and its coalition partners sanction their administration. A fragile

infrastructure that had been severely impacted by fighting, instability in government, administrative flaws, and poverty was takeover by the new Afghan leadership. The suspension in donor financing, primarily from West and the United States of America, that during the Obama administration made up approximately seventy-five percent of the Afghan government expenditures, eliminated the lifeline of the financial system and undermines a moral for humanity. The United States has banned cash supplies to Afghanistan and seized nearly every penny that approximately nine billion dollars in total savings held by the Afghanistan monetary authority. The EU is ceasing one billion dollars for humanitarian aid. The Bretton Woods Institutions, among other transnational organizations, have prevented the contemporary Afghan government from obtaining monetary assistance. The Afghan government under the Taliban refuse to negotiate or back down, in a situation of severe sanctions. Their government refuse to comply with investor demands, such as equitable distribution of authority, observance of basic liberties, participation of females as well as performance of combating terrorist activities commitments. However, before making any compromises of themselves, the Washington along with additional significant nations, like Beijing and Moscow, demand to get additional efforts towards global terrorists, despite indications that the Afghan's government may relax restrictions on females' schooling.

Pakistan is anxious concerning a neighboring country that is unsettled and on the edge of financial disintegration, which might have across boundaries repercussions such as an influx of migrants looking for sanctuary on Pakistani soil. It additionally worries about the Taliban's ongoing ties with terrorist organizations operating in Kabul as well as the possible effects of a radical leadership there on domestic sectarianism factions (James, 2022).

6.2 Security Implications for Pakistan:

Islamabad's worries over Kabul are mostly focused on New Delhi. the country's concerns would continue to grow in direct proportion to the expansion of New Delhi engagement in Kabul. When discussing eastern involvement in west, Islamabad's international Affairs Minister, stated that securing our border where our rival state India lies is necessary before everyone wants Islamabad to concentrate on securing the west frontier. he further added that there has been no significant developing and that there are no lengthy lines for visas in India. New Delhi has a major influence in Kabul, that worries Pakistan. In an intercepted communication from the United States Consulate, Islamabad reportedly requested that Washington order New Delhi to scale back her presence in Kabul and cease its subversive operations in southwest province of Pakistan. According to Islamabad authorities, the southwest province Balochistan situation is directly proportion to the Kabul situation. Most often, every violent activity act in southwest province of Pakistan is prepared in Kabul. Numerous American politicians have repeatedly stated to advocate for redrawing the physical frontiers between Islamabad and Kabul as well as openly advanced the notion that the United States would benefit from an autonomous the Pakistani province. Selig Harrison, Head of Asian Programmes, proposed in 2011 that the United States could benefit from an independent Baluchistan. He didn't just propose the notion of a sovereign Balochistan; he also offered a strategy and said that an Islamabad with an unfettered Balochistan will not just solve the problems that the United States has in the area, yet also put an ended to chaos and unrest in the area.

The United States would thus have a "secure environment" to conduct both open and hidden actions that promote its own domestic goals. Ex Lieutenant. Col. Ralph Peters, a United States armed planer, says in the paper he wrote "Blood Borders" the current frontiers of Tehran,

Islamabad, and Kabul, ought to be redrawn once more and that their separation isn't inherent and that doing so is within the Washington's ongoing goal. Selig Harrison went on to say that to restrain the Chinese operations in Islamabad, America must engage in "a tough game" when backing those factions who want liberation for their province from Pakistan. Powerful Baloch rebels with American support could ultimately benefit American crucial objectives by demoralizing Beijing in the area. Documents and remarks made by competent United States executives indicate the fact that is likely that America wouldn't merely fail to express concerns to Mosad and RAW's surveillance operations in southwest province of Pakistan that put her territorial sovereignty in danger, but Washington would even promote these measures. Amarjit Singh, a very conservative New Delhi defense planner, also holds a comparable outlook (Zia, 2020).

6.3 Economic Implications for Pakistan:

To convince Islamabad, the US Administration under President Donald Trump has also adopted an alternate approach. The government of Donald Trump is relying on other approaches to influence the country's actions instead of utilizing immediate aid, that will have no significant impact due to the Pakistani government financial connection with Beijing. Particularly, the government acted in Feb 2018 to modify Islamabad's position within the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), an organization that investigates the funding of terrorism. In June of the following year, Islamabad got added to the Financial Action Task Force's "grey list" for greater surveillance; this classification hinders trade into the state and damages the economy.

She was also included under the "grey list" for the period of three years, as well as in 2008. Islamabad has launched operation targeting terrorist organizations whilst 2018 to prevent getting included on a list of state sponsors of terrorism, which include imposing financial

constraints on Lashkar-e-Taiba and jailing the organization's head, Hafiz Saeed, for the period of eleven years because of funding terrorism. By enacting laws to support its position, has made it a top priority to remove itself off the list. FATF reported that Islamabad has achieved "essential achievement" and has mostly handled many cases in its most recent evaluation, which was released in October. it is going to keep being on the "grey list" and has till Feb 2021 to meet the demands.

Although the FATF ranking is worldwide and thus a fewer explicit strategical instrument for influencing policy than the United States aid, numerous analysts within Islamabad continue to view it as a tool of the United States, and as a result, citizen an outrage over Islamabad's inclusion on the FATF list is rising. the US president's Islamabad strategy exposes a pragmatic aspect, despite criticism for his lax handling of the USA's relationships and coquetry towards the adversaries. During the initial period, Islamabad has generally viewed the U.S. more pragmatic strategy towards the Kabul reconciliation effort favorably. But it's also clear that the constraints of President Donald Trump's bluster as well absence of his research prior to delivering statements. The US president failed to fulfil his pledge to Islamabad to increase cooperation.

The United States Foreign Affairs Ministry claims that Islamabad's "essential commercial environment problems such as compliance obstacles, fragile trademark security measures, and discriminatory taxation," have prevented American companies from making investments there. The Financial Action Task Force is a more efficient monetary instrument over funding, for the government of President Donald Trump to urge Islamabad to act against extremist organizations. This strategy has been successful thus yet. Islamabad is keen to get rid of its reputation as a supporter of extremism and is coming to understand that financial

growth, not geopolitical relevance, determines one's place in the world. However, most of the citizens belongs to Pakistan have questioned how their country is being demonized due to her association with organization, after the US government struck an agreement with it and granted them recognition. The majority public belongs to Pakistan want confirmation from the US government under the leadership of Donald Trump on this issue (Afzal, 2020).

6.4 Indio-US Partnership; Implications for Pakistan:

Delhi was given an important position in Kabul as part of President Trump's Afghanistan strategy, and she was made a significant partner. She was invited by him to participate in the advancement of Kabul. Kabul and New Delhi agreed on an alliance of defense in 2011. India currently occupies an important part in Kabul, pursuant to the deal. New Delhi involvement in Kabul made Islamabad concerned for its safety. In the address he gave at the Arab-Islamic-United States summit conducted in Saudia Arabia on the twenty-fourth of May 2017, US President pointed out that extremism impacts and damages New Delhi as well. Trump made no comments about Islamabad's part in the global fight on terrorism or appreciate the Pakistani military actions to apprehend terrorism, which performed an important part and cost many innocent bloods.

Donald Trump delayed interacting with the PM of Islamabad during the summit, denying him the opportunity to express Islamabad's perspective. However, having a conversation with Ashraf Ghani, the Kabul's leader. Islamabad's circumstance considerably worsened after the United States president encouraged Delhi to help the United States in Kabul, notably in the financial realm, and to participate in Kabul's growth since Islamabad saw New Delhi as a potential danger.

The fundamental concern of Islamabad over New Delhi on both the Afghanistan and Indian boundaries was exacerbated by the US president's strategic stance towards New Delhi. Such numerous modifications brought problems for Islamabad and pushed her to look for alternative ways to safeguard her national objectives. United States of America and India, both states leader interact with each other in 2017, during the interaction, the significance of connections among the two nations has been highlighted, as a means of ensuring Kabul's peace and restoring peace, rebuilding, and renewal.

Even though United States provided financial assistance to Islamabad, she lost countless non-combatants and members of its security services. Islamabad believed that by assisting America in the battle against terrorism, it would receive a position in Kabul next Afghan government and assistance for the Kashmir dispute. However, this assumption has since been disproven. Rather, United States is forcing Pakistan to refrain from aiding Kashmiri supporters of liberty, designate these individuals as violent, and forbid that they refrain from using Islamabad soil to coordinate its activities in Indian-controlled Kashmir.

Numerous military actions carried out by the Pakistani military in the Federally Administrated Tribal Areas as well as additional regions to the north, such military actions include Zarbe-Azab and Radul-Fisad, have importance in that respect. However, Washington characterizes missions executed by Pakistani military authorities towards extremist factions or groups considered superficial because they are not happy with the measures conducted towards violent factions in Islamabad.

In the present scenario, United States of America consider the Haqqani organization for an instance and accuse the Islamic Republic of Pakistan especially its armed forces, of failing to

take decisive steps to dismantle the structure. Ties among Islamabad and the United States grew heated over her involvement in Kabul. The US president Trump expressed mistrust for Islamabad's armed institutions, also claimed how their forces were sustaining terrorism that had been engaged in extremist's actions including causing instability in Kabul. In contrast, Islamabad's ruling coalition views her rival supremacy as well as involvement as an indicator of unpredictability and uncertainty in Kabul. She expressed grave worries regarding Delhi's support for the hostile structure in Afghanistan and claimed that Delhi supports violent organizations which utilize Kabul for the headquarters as well as organize and launch attacks in Islamabad (Naz, 2019).

6.5 Trump's Policy: Impact on US-Pakistan Relations

United States views Islamabad as fostering the issue in the area, particularly in Kabul. The rising US sympathy towards Delhi has aggravated Pakistan and US relationships, which are essential for maintaining harmony and security within the area. The revised American tactical objectives and repercussions towards Islamabad, which have already been in process before the beginning of the era, were not expected by Pakistani political analysts. Our policy planners have taken the end effect unexpectedly, is that the sudden and more antagonistic American stance against Islamabad, as an element of an issue instead of an alternative for stability in the area. A lot of discussion has been sparked by the US president's remarks about Islamabad, internal as well as external parts of the nation. A few various root causes for the deteriorating Pakistan and US relations, which are economic, and safety focused. Whatever hasn't been discussed or taken into consideration, still is Delhi's rising impact on US strategy and stance regarding Islamabad. To determine the causes of the current rise in US hostility against Islamabad, it is essential to

comprehend the India and American growing cooperation. The unmanned aircraft attacks programmes of the US administration under the president Trump, against Islamabad is a blatant breach of Islamabad's integrity along with disobeying of global law. Via official and unofficial channels of communication, her officials continue to be criticizing the United States government. The unmanned aircraft attacks that launched by the US to kill terrorists, also target the non-combatants, especially females and kids (Rabbi, 2022).

Islamabad has become involved in a conflict which has been thrust upon her, by the United States after 9/11, rather itself. According to the US president message, which he shared from his social platform, that Pakistan was given payment and compensation for the costs associated with its armed forces expenditures that were solely designed to help the United States in war on terror.

6.6 Trump Afghan-Peace Plan: Implications for Pakistan

President Trump was highly dismissive of the Afghan military blunder by the United States. One of his most important campaign promises to the people was to withdraw from Kabul. With the 2020 election approaching, he has intensified his attempts to reach a ceasefire in Afghanistan. No negotiations in Kabul will be successful, despite Islamabad's strong collaboration, which Donald Trump is persuading and pursuing to secure the diplomatic triumph necessary for domestic electoral gain. As a result, the Afghanistan crisis has brought the two countries Pakistan and United States to a phase of cooperation, due to the Donald Trump ambition seeking a diplomatic achievement and Islamabad's worsening financial difficulties, and the approaching Financial Action Task Force pressure.

The Pakistani leader Imran Khan paid his first 3 days trip to the United States in the month of July 2019, to resolve the disagreement and strengthen the rebirth of the relationship. This trip took place during the prevailing Afghanistan reconciliation process that Pakistan is mediating. The American leader Trump gave the Pakistan's Prime Minister a cordial greeting, expressed recognition for Pakistan, while also promised his diplomatic services to facilitate negotiations on Kashmir issue in exchange for Islamabad's valuable assistance to United States reach an agreement on stability in Kabul. Additionally, the rebirth among relationship gained momentum after the two heads of state reconnected on the margins of the 74th United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) session in September of that year. According to Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan, "Resilience within Kabul implies peace in Islamabad." Imran Khan also discussed the current Delhi's crackdown in Kashmir following her invasion of the region, the United States President expressing a willingness of facilitating talks whenever the two nations India and Pakistan wished (Yameen, 2022).

6.7 Afghan-Peace Process and the Pakistan's Role:

Although the United States of America have used inappropriate language, but she also tries to maintain good ties with Islamabad because it is essential to advancing American objectives in the area. The primary reason is Islamabad must be completely engaged there, to have a comprehensive resolution to the war in Kabul. Together, Washington and Kabul soldiers are insufficient to drive out the rebels and retake the enormous areas of land under the terrorist control. For instance, during Presidency of Donald Trump, there are now less than fifteen thousand United States forces in the Afghanistan spectacle, contrary to a total of hundred thousand during the leadership of Obama. Since Islamabad has traditionally exerted significant power on the Taliban, it is essential that it take part in all discussions aimed at resolving the

dispute among the Taliban and the government of Afghanistan. In addition, Islamabad's collaboration is crucial for maintaining influence over a boundary with Kabul, which Islamabad has tried to secure with a barrier to stop militants' penetration from Kabul, even though opposition and reluctance on behalf of the Afghanistan administration.

The US needs Pakistan because she is essential to American efforts to combat terrorism. The biggest collection of militants groups in the entire globe is found in Kabul and Islamabad, where 20 of them are acknowledged through the United States authorities. To combat terrorist organizations by preventative policies, the Pakistani government and military institutions' assistance is required. Additionally, if Islamabad permits the USA to act as a mediator in talks with Delhi, certainly is no chance of an end to the Srinagar problem (Holland, 2019).

However, due to the USA's inclination favoring Delhi and the move of her consulate from Israel's city to the capital of Israel, its trustworthiness being an arbitrator has recently been severely damaged in Islamabad's view. Furthermore, the only true possibility, the US possesses for supporting its soldiers in Kabul, is through Islamabad. For the United States to maintain this logistics channel, Islamabad must assist.

Islamabad is crucial to the region's financial cooperation, which is a key objective of United States international approach. Because of Islamabad's affluence, security, and the resilience of its key structures, such as the armed forces and the government, the USA takes an acute stake in preventing the acquisition of nuclear warheads by terrorists. Islamabad ranks as the 6th largest populated nation on the globe having an inhabitant of over two hundred million. Thus, harmony in the area, is supported by the country's integrity. As a result, American economic assistance to Islamabad is still substantial even though the degree of security backing is decreasing. Besides

Kabul, Islamabad is the country in the area that receives the most United States development aid (Karim, 2017).

Conclusion

The vital position of Kabul, the ineffectiveness of its administration, its ethnic sections, and a lack of effective governmental and interpersonal capabilities continue to draw the attention of key nations. The September 11 catastrophe is most readily recognized for the result of American former Soviet strategies against Kabul. Currently, Islamabad is dealing with a safety challenge. Islamabad's bordering states, as well as countries within her area and out-side the area having an objective in South Asia, so she has taken various political efforts to secure her territorial integrity. The Federally Administer population likewise views such policies with mistrust as well as uncertainty.

Even though Islamabad and Delhi, both play an important role in the South Asia, most specifically when it comes to the Kabul crisis. Islamabad has close ties with Kabul as both neighbors share same culture, but she is far greater anxious regarding stability in Kabul than India. Considering a prominent foreign player as well as dominion, the United States has always had a pro-India slant throughout the course of its engagements in the nations suffering from crisis. A particular primary military objective of the United States of America is to restrain Beijing, but this cannot be accomplished despite Islamabad's assistance, but Islamabad perhaps not support this goal.

In addition to that, American politicians claim that Pakistan and US hold different perspectives on the stability of Kabul. Considering its unease towards Beijing, Delhi also pursues an Afghan strategy that is focused on Islamabad. Specifically, under the leadership of Donald Trump, the overlapping goals of India and US have forced the two nations to work together to a greater extent. As the contrary side, Pakistan believes that the origins of the conflict in Baluchistan are

held by other countries that are based in Kabul whereas, Islamabad is being increasingly surrounded by Delhi's presence in Kabul.

Through stepping up many points of contention on Pakistan, the US president's actions regarding Islamabad show a significant break from the restrictions imposed by previous administrations. To be more explicit, the United State is actively using a few strategies regarding Islamabad, including support reductions, termination of arms collaboration, including outright threats of strategic operations. According to Pakistan, mutually beneficial as well as friendly Pakistan and United States relations are negatively impacted by the sustained United States influence. In line with US goals, Trump's administration seeks a change of course in Islamabad's geographic strategy and stance. His claims of hiding places and a clandestine connection to the terrorists' organizations would only increase the gap among both nations, which already has a poor history of enmity along with suspicion. Islamabad's authorities must adjust the nation's military objectives and diplomatic alternatives to meet the challenges of the altered international safety as well as financial environment.

Given the rapidly shifting in demographic and financial environment of the surrounding region and the world, the relationship among Islamabad and the United States are expected to worsen with serious repercussions for global stability and prosperity. Islamabad is concerned that increasing American influence along with antagonistic Indian actions are intended to create a path for complete Delhi control in the area. Considering the deteriorating relationship among the Washington and Islamabad, a latest aggressive as well reckless comment made by the head of the New Delhi military, casting doubt on Islamabad's atomic discouragement must be considered. It seeks to place the country below expanding geopolitical pressure to exhaust Islamabad's Armed Forces and financial capabilities.

New Delhi has benefited from the increasing Washington pressure on Islamabad in this way. Both the United States and her alliance partner should invest greater resources into administration and economic growth instead of pursuing a defensive strategy, which has not succeeded in bringing harmony and prosperity to the nation, which has been torn apart by battle, as seen through an escalating uprising. Islamabad should cooperate with the United States towards a successful cease-fire and a broader embrace of the insurgents since these are the only realistic and workable solutions to the protracted Afghanistan insurgency.

Under the leadership of President Donald Trump, who seeks a possibility of a successful departure from the Afghanistan stalemate by achieving a ceasefire with the Afghanistan Jihadist, the continuous bilateral conversation among the United States and the Jihadist has opened more room towards alignment and collaboration. The relationship between Islamabad and the United States is currently in a difficult place. The continuing negotiations for an eternal stability in Kabul devastated by conflict, have created fresh opportunities for deeper collaboration among both nations, whose lengthy political rivalry has been interrupted by temporary agreement underpinned by an instrumental attitude. Each governments have a pair of options: whether enter an unfamiliar landscape of rising hostility having unpredictable consequence and the second one is reorganized as well as mend the strained relationships via establishing mutually beneficial partnership based on collaboration that results in an advantageous result to the two of them.

Therefore, if the chance of possibility isn't wasted, an effective Afghanistan stability conference holds the ability not merely to restore stability to the nation as well as to save Islamabad and United States relations.

In the context of international affairs, the Trump administration's Afghanistan strategy reflects the country's move away from Islamabad to New Delhi to be its main partner in the area, because of Beijing's burgeoning influence in the region. The decision maintains a pattern of decreasing American military support to Islamabad that has been evident throughout 2011 because of anger in America over her inability to provide secure shelter to terrorists trying to destabilize the Afghanistan leadership.

Bibliography

- Aakim. Abbasi, N. M. (2014). Impact of terrorism on Pakistan. *Institute of Strategic Studies*.
- Afzal, M. (2020). Evaluating the Trump administration's Pakistan reset. *Brookings*.
- Akhtar, N. (2011). Pakistan And US Partnership: Cost or Benefit? *International Journal on World Peace*.
- Akram, S. (2017). Presidential Change in the US: Implications for Pakistan. *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad*.
- Ali ahmed Jalali, L. W. (1999). *The Other Side of the Mountains: Mujahideen Tactics in the Soviet War*. Khansas: Foreign Military Studies Office.
- Andrew. (2020). *The China-Pakistan Axis: Asia's New Politics*. London: Hurst.
- Anwar, S. (2021). Afghan Refugees: Implications on Pakistan. *Pak. Journal of Int'L Affairs*.
- Arnold, A. (1985). *Afghanistan; The Soviet Invasion in Perspective*. New Delhi: Hoover Press publications.
- Ashley. (2017). Ashley. *Carnegie Endowment For International Peace*.
- Ashraf, M. (2010). Image of U.S. in Pakistani Elite Newspaper Editorials after 9/11. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 325-339.
- Ateeq. (2017). NA adopts resolution rejecting 'hostile and threatening' statements made by Trump. *Dawn NEWS*.
- Aziz. (2018). Pakistan-US war of words over Donald Trump's tweet. *Aljazeera*.
- B, S. (2007). 9/11 and New York City Firefighters' Post Hoc Unit Support and Control Climates: A Context Theory of the Consequences of Involvement in Traumatic Work-Related Events. *Academy of Management*.
- Babar. (2018). Pak-Russia relations and Trump's strategy. *Daily Times*.
- Bacon, T. (2022). Deadly Cooperation: The Shifting ties between AL-QAEDA and the Taliban. *War on the Rocks*.
- Baruah, A. (2009). Pakistan needs our help, but no blank cheque: Obama. *The Hindustan Times*.
- Behuria, A. (2007). The rise of Pakistani Taliban and the response of the state. *Strategic Analysis*.
- Bhandari, S. M. (2021). What Is a Research Design | Types, Guide & Examples. *Scribbr*.

- Bhatti. (2018). Pak-Russia relations and Trump's strategy. *The Daily Times*.
- Blank, S. (2017). Moscow's Double Game in Afghanistan. *Global Research and Analysis*.
- Bouton, M. M. (2017). *The Trump Administration's India Opportunity*. Asia Society.
- Busch, A. E. (1997). Ronald Reagan and the Defeat of the Soviet Empire. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*.
- Cai, F. (2011). Absolute and Relative Gains in the Real World. *E.International Relations*.
- Charles. (2022). Afghanistan in Anarchy: America's Withdrawal, Taliban Rule and Regional Implications for Central Asia. *Sagr Journal*.
- Chen. (2011). *A historical timeline of Afghanistan*. PBS NEWS HOURS.
- Cramer, C. (2002). Try Again, Fail Again, Fail Better? War, the State, and the 'Post-Conflict' Challenge in Afghanistan. *International Institute of Social Studies*.
- Cutler. (2017). President Barack Obama's Counterterrorism Strategy and Legacy: The Case of Afghanistan. *Cambridge Core*.
- Cutler, L. (2017). President Barack Obama's Counterterrorism Strategy and Legacy: The Case of Afghanistan. *Cambridge Core*.
- Daniel. (2020). *China's Western Horizon: Beijing and the*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- David. (2000). *Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion in Retrospect*. USA: University of Arizona.
- DeYoung, K. (2013). U.S. to launch peace talks with Taliban. *Washington Post*.
- Durrani, A. (2022). Iran's Afghan policy after the U.S. withdrawal: Implications for Pakistan and the region. *PIPS*.
- Ettinger, A. (2018). Trump's National Security Strategy: "America First" meets the establishment. *International Journal*, 10.
- Forde, S. (1995). International realism and the science of politics: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and neorealism. *International Studies Quarterly*, 141-160.
- Gazis, O. (2023). China "most consequential threat" to U.S. national security. *CBS News*.
- Glad, B. (1991). Jimmy Carter and the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan. *Springer Link*.
- Goodson, L. P. (2014). The New Great Game: Pakistan's Approach to Afghanistan after 2014. *Asia Journal*.

- Grau, L. (2004). The Soviet–Afghan War: A Superpower Mired in the Mountains. *Journal of Slavic Military Studies*.
- Hassan, S. R. (2017). Trump talks tough on Pakistan's 'terrorist' havens, but options scarce. *Reuters*.
- Hauner, M. L. (2009). Afghanistan Between the Great Powers, 1938–1945. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Hellen. (2023). *Neorealism: Kenneth Waltz 'Theory of International Politics' Research Paper*. IvyPanda. Retrieved from IvyPanda.
- Hobbs, T. (2016). *Thomas Hobbes: Leviathan (Longman library of primary sources in philosophy)*. Routledge.
- Holland, D. K. (2019). The Implications of the Trump Administration's South Asia.
- Hudson, M. C. (1996). Hudson, M. C. (1996). To Play the Hegemon: Fifty Years of US Policy toward the Middle East. *The Middle East Journal* . *The Middle East Journal*.
- Huston. (2017). The U.S. War in Afghanistan. *Council on Foreign Relations*.
- James. (2022). Pakistan's Hard Policy Choices in Afghanistan. *International Crisis Group*.
- James Griffiths. (2017, August 24). *Trump calls out Pakistan, India as he pledges to 'fight to win' in Afghanistan*. Retrieved from CNN: <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/08/21/politics/trump-afghanistan-pakistan-india/index.html>
- Johnson, T. H. (2008). No Sign until the Burst of Fire: Understanding the Pakistan-Afghanistan Frontier. *Harvard Kennedy School*.
- Kalim, S. (2019). #WeareUnited,. *Sage Journal*.
- Karim, M. (2017). World Powers Rivalry in Afghanistan and Its Effects. *Qurtaba*.
- Khalid. (2017). US Afghan Strategy:. *Global Social Sciences Review*.
- Khan, R. (2013). Was the NATO Invasion of Afghanistan Legal? *E.International Relations*.
- Khuldune, K. (2018). Trump's Crude Hostility Is Pushing Pakistan Toward America's Foes: China, Russia - Even Iran. *Haaretz*.
- Kugelman, M. (2019). Trump's Hard Line on Pakistan Is All Bluster. *Foreign Policy*.
- Lahoud, N. (2021). Bin Laden's Catastrophic Success. *Foreign Affairs*.

- Landler, M. (2016). Obama Says He Will Keep More Troops in Afghanistan Than Planned. *The New York Times*.
- Larry. (2014). The New Great Game: Pakistan's Approach to Afghanistan after 2014. *Asia Journal*.
- Leiter, B. (2010). Classical Realism. *Philosophical Issues*, 244-267.
- Li, X. (2010). Stages of a Crisis and Media Frames and Functions: U.S. Television Coverage of the 9/11 Incident During the First 24 Hours. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 670-687 .
- Lloyd. (2022). *Message to the Force - One Year Since the Conclusion of the Afghanistan War*. US Department of Defence.
- Lloyd J. Austin, I. (2022). *Message to the Force - One Year Since the Conclusion of the Afghanistan War*. US Department of Defence.
- Markey, D. (2020). How the United States Should Deal. *Carneige Tsinghua Centre for Global Policy*.
- Masood. (2021). Pakistan-China Relations in a Changing Geopolitical Environment. *Institute of South Asian Studies*.
- Morgan, G. (2007). Myth and reality in the great game. *Asian Affairs*.
- NATO and Afghanistan. (2022). *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*.
- Naz, S. (2019). Pakistan-America Relations during Trump Era: The Afghanistan Factor. *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 207-217.
- Nazir, P. (2010). War on Terror in Pakistan and Afghanistan: discursive and political contestations. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 63-81.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.
- Omrani, B. (2010). Rethinking the Durand Line. *The RUSI*, 48-56.
- Parenti, C. (2015). Flower of War: An Environmental History of Opium Poppy in Afghanistan. *The SAIS Review of International Affairs*.
- Parpiani, K. (2018). India-US relations under Trump: Guarding against transactionalism by pivoting to the US legislature. *Observer Research Foundation*.

- Peter. (2013). India-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership: An Analysis of India, Afghanistan and Pakistan Perspectives. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication*.
- Phillips, A. (2021). Trump's deal with the Taliban, explained. *The Washington Post*.
- Phillips, J. (1980). *The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan*. Europe: The Herritage Foundation.
- Qayum, H. (2017). Afghanistan in the Historical Perspective. *Global political review*.
- Rabbi, F. (2022). Donald Trump's Policy And Posture Towards Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 194-207.
- Rabia. (2013). Was the NATO Invasion of Afghanistan Legal? *E.International Relations*.
- Raza. (2017). Trump talks Tough on Pakistan's 'Terrorist' havens. *Asia Pacific*.
- Reuter. (2009, March 27). New U.S. strategy on Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- Rubin, B. R. (1994). Afghanistan in 1993: Abandoned but Surviving. *Asian Survey*.
- Saba. (2018). *Pakistan-US war of words over Donald Trump's tweet*. Aljazeera.
- Sarwar, N. (2009). US Drone attacks inside Pakistan Territory: UN Charter. *Institute of Strategic Studies*.
- Shannon, H.-F. H. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Research Gate*.
- Simpson, A. W. (2018). Realism, Small States and Neutrality. *E.International Relations*.
- Smith, C. (n.d.). The Great Game and Afghanistan. *Library of Congress*.
- Staff. (2023). Biden administration defends Afghanistan withdrawal. *Al Jazeera*.
- Strausz-Hupe, R. (n.d.). The Anglo-Afghan War of 1919. *Military Affairs*.
- Takeyh, R. (2021). Where Iran Stands on the Taliban Takeover in Afghanistan. *Counccil on Foreign Relations*.
- Teijgeler, R. (2015). Afghan Political Parties: a short outline. *Academia Edu*.
- Tellis, A. J. (2020). On Trump's Visit to India. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.
- Tricia, B. (2018). Deadly Cooperation: The Shifting ties between AL-QAEDA and the Taliban. *War on Rock*.
- Tughral. (2021). Afghan Peace Process and Security Implications for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Terrorism Research*.

- Wajahat. (2018). Pakistan pivots toward Putin's Russia after Trump gets tough. *NBC NEWS*.
- Walt. (1988). The Orgine of War in neorealist theory. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*.
- Walt, K. (1988). The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory. *JSTOR*.
- Westermann, E. B. (1997). *The Limits of Soviet Airpower: The Bear Versus the Mujahideen in Afghanistan, 1979-1989*. Defence Technical Information Centre.
- Whyte. (2012). Neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism: born of the same approach? *E.International Relations*.
- Whyte, A. (012). Neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism: born of the same approach? *E.International relations*.
- Yameen. (2022). *Pakistan Journal of Terrorism reserach*.
- Yousaf. (2017). *How 9/11 changed Pakistan*. The Express Tribune.
- Yousaf, K. (2017). *How 9/11 changed Pakistan*. The Express Tribune.
- Zia, M. T. (2020). Indo- US Strategic Objectives in Afghanistan: Security. *South Asian Studie*, 119-130.