



Pakistan's role in cross Border Terrorism in India and America's Response

Ch Chiranjibi Rao,

P.G. Department of Political Science, Berhampur University, Berhampur-760007,
Ganjam, Odisha

Abstract: *This Paper deals with a comparative analysis of the Bush, Clinton and Obama Administration's foreign policy in fighting against cross border terrorism in India. Smart Power had become the core principle of Obama's foreign policy, and was used in order to improve the country's image, therefore attracting others and permitting the U.S. to continue to lead. Smart Power is a combination of soft and hard power, i.e. the U.S. trying to find a balance between defence and diplomacy (as well as development aid) in order to achieve foreign policy goals.*

Key words: *policy goals, terrorist groups, militant activities*

Introduction

This Paper deals with a comparative analysis of the Bush, Clinton and Obama Administration's foreign policy in fighting against cross border terrorism in India. This includes focusing on points such as American leadership and grand strategy, cooperation with allies, Afghanistan and Iraq amongst other foreign policy areas.⁽¹⁾ Pakistan has long been accused by its neighbours India and Afghanistan, and western nations like the United States, and the United Kingdom of its involvement in terrorist activities in the region and beyond. Pakistan's tribal region along the border of Afghanistan has been claimed to be a "haven for terrorists" by western media and the United States Defense Secretary.⁽²⁾ Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) of providing help to the Taliban and rebels in Kashmir.⁽³⁾

Cross Border Terrorism- Response

Gordon Thomas states that whilst aiding in the capture of Al Qaeda members, Pakistan "still sponsored terrorist groups

in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, funding, training and arming them in their war of attrition against India". Even now it is not certain that key members of Pakistan's intelligence service have repudiated their Taliban clients.⁽⁴⁾

Afghanistan is not the only place where Pakistani leaders have flirted with terrorist clients. Pakistan has also assisted rebel forces in Kashmir even though those groups have committed terrorist acts against civilians. And it should be noted that a disproportionate number of the extremist madrasas schools funded by the Saudis operate in Pakistan." Pakistan's former ambassador to the U.S., Husain Haqqani has said Pakistan sponsors terrorism.⁽⁵⁾ India has been consistent in alleging that Pakistan was involved in training and arming underground militant groups to fight Indian forces in Kashmir.⁽⁶⁾ The ISI, has often been accused of playing a role in major terrorist attacks across India including terrorism in Kashmir, the July 2006 Mumbai Train Bombings, the 2001



Indian Parliament attack, the 2006 Varanasi bombings, the August 2007 Hyderabad bombings, and the November 2008 Mumbai attacks. The ISI is also accused of supporting Taliban forces and recruiting and training mujahideen to fight in Afghanistan and Kashmir. Based on communication intercepts, US intelligence agencies concluded Pakistan's ISI was behind the attack on the Indian embassy in Kabul on 7 July 2008, a charge that the governments of India and Afghanistan had laid previously.⁽⁷⁾

Pakistan is said to be a haven for terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), Jaish-e-Mohammed (JeM) and Sipah-e-Sahaba. Pakistan is accused of giving aid to the Taliban,⁽⁸⁾ "which include[s] soliciting funding for the Taliban, bankrolling Taliban operations, providing diplomatic support as the Taliban's virtual emissaries abroad, arranging training for Taliban fighters, recruiting skilled and unskilled manpower to serve in Taliban armies, planning and directing offensives, providing and facilitating shipments of ammunition and fuel, and on several occasions apparently directly providing combat support," as stated by the Human Rights Watch. In 2008, the US has stated that the next attack on the US could originate in Pakistan.⁽⁹⁾

United Nations Organization (UNO) has also publicly increased pressure on Pakistan on its inability to control its Afghanistan border and not restricting the activities of Taliban leaders who have been declared by the UN as terrorists.⁽¹⁰⁾ The United States had direct evidence that the ISI chief, Lt. Gen. Ahmed Shuja Pasha, knew of Bin Laden's presence in Abbottabad, Pakistan.⁽¹¹⁾

In 2011, American troops reportedly recovered Pakistani military supplies from Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan.⁽¹²⁾ In June 2014, Washington declared JuD an LeT affiliate and announced head money for JuD's political wing chief and Saeed's brother-in-law Abdur Rahman Makki. Zaki ur-Rehman Lakhvi, the leader of Lashkar-e-Taiba and allegedly the planner of 2008 Mumbai attacks was released in Pakistan which caused condemnations in India.⁽¹³⁾

On 5 April 2006, the Indian police arrested six Islamic militants, including a cleric who helped plan bomb blasts in Varanasi.⁽¹⁴⁾ The cleric is believed to be a commander of a banned South Asian Islamic militant group, Harkat-ul-Jihad al-Islami, and is linked to the ISI. Pakistan denied involvement in militant activities in Kashmir, though President Asif Ali Zardari admitted in July 2010 that militants had been "deliberately created and nurtured" by past governments "as a policy to achieve some short-term tactical objectives" stating that they were "heroes" until 9/11.⁽¹⁵⁾

In October 2010, former Pakistan President and former head of the Pakistan Army, Pervez Musharraf revealed that Pakistani armed forces trained militant groups to fight Indian forces in Kashmir. Many Kashmiri militant groups designated as terrorist organisations by the US still maintain their headquarters in Pakistan-administered Kashmir. This is cited by the Indian government as further proof that Pakistan supports terrorism.⁽¹⁶⁾

Both the Bush and Obama Administration emphasised on American leadership as a part of their grand strategy. In the Bush Administration's 2006 NSS this was a key theme.



According to the strategy, effective action depended on American leadership since 'the international community is most engaged in such action when the United States leads.'⁽¹⁷⁾ Similar to this, the Obama Administration in its 2010 NSS mentions America's 'global leadership', stating that 'global security depends upon strong and responsible American leadership.'⁽¹⁸⁾

Both administrations focused on cooperating with allies and working with others in order to address the challenges which the world is facing. According to the Bush Administration, it was 'to strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends' and was to also 'develop agendas for cooperative action with the other main centres of global power.'⁽¹⁹⁾ Continuing with this, the Obama Administration included 'comprehensive engagement' as a part of its strategy.⁽¹⁹⁾

Such engagement would not only focus on its traditional allies, but would expand to include 'more effective partnerships with other key centres of influence.'⁽²⁰⁾

Although the two administrations preferred cooperation with allies and partners, they both were willing to act unilaterally if need be. The Bush Administration was 'prepared to act alone if necessary.'⁽²¹⁾ The Obama Administration was also ready to work alone which was evident in the case of Pakistan and the killing of OBL.⁽²²⁾

The U.S. Secretary of Defence under the Bush Administration, Robert Gates, was also kept during the Obama Administration.⁽²³⁾ This was a sign of continuity amongst Obama's promise for change. This implied that defence policies would remain consistent, especially in

areas where both Gates and President Obama would agree.

Continuity has also been evident in the policy area on Afghanistan. The Obama Administration increased the number of troops present in Afghanistan, which were on a mission to defeat al-Qaeda and reverse Taliban's momentum in order for them not to be able to overthrow the government.⁽²⁴⁾

This increase was the same option which was recommended to the Bush Administration by the war strategy reviews of 2008.⁽²⁵⁾ In fact, by the end of his second term, Bush had already approved the deployment of around 15,000 troops to Afghanistan for the following year.⁽²⁶⁾

The withdrawal of U.S. troops and the ending of the war in Iraq under the Obama Administration also represents continuity. In 2008 the Bush Administration had negotiated a U.S.-Iraq Status of Forces Agreement⁽³²⁷⁾ in which it agreed that by the end of 2011 there would be a total withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraqi territory.⁽³⁹⁾ When Obama took office, the administration kept the date set by its predecessor for the departure of troops, which brought the war in Iraq to an end.

However, there has also been change between the two administrations' foreign policy.

The Bush Doctrine was greatly based on realist beliefs. The administration's foreign policy was focused on the idea of American exceptionalism and the idea of the predominance of American power, especially hard power, based on military and economic might. Such a 'self-centred' foreign policy led to the deterioration of



U.S. image abroad and brought a rise to anti-American sentiment.⁽²⁸⁾

In contrast to the Bush Doctrine, Obama's foreign policy strategy aimed at reaffirming U.S. leadership in a world where America's power has been challenged by new actors.⁽²⁹⁾

Smart Power had become the core principle of Obama's foreign policy, and was used in order to improve the country's image, therefore attracting others and permitting the U.S. to continue to lead. Smart Power is a combination of soft and hard power, i.e. the U.S. trying to find a balance between defence and diplomacy (as well as development aid) in order to achieve foreign policy goals.

The Bush Administration responded to the 9/11 attacks by declaring a GWOT which came to dominate its foreign policy. Iraq and terrorism became two of its top priorities. When it came to the terrorist threat, the administration did not make a distinction as to which terrorists he was after, focusing on the global threat of terrorism. In Obama's presidential campaign, he made it evident that he wanted to shed away from the Bush Doctrine. Right from the beginning he neglected the term WOT, yet this did not mean that the U.S. was to no longer be at war. To the contrary, the Obama Administration continued the war. However, the administration refocused the war to be a fight against some terrorist organisations, i.e. al-Qaeda and its partners.⁽³⁰⁾

The Obama Administration also attempted to reframe the war by giving it a lower profile since it did not want counterterrorism to dominate its foreign policy. It wanted to give more priority to foreign policy areas such as nuclear

disarmament and non-proliferation. However, although the WOT dominated the Bush Administration's foreign policy, by its second term there had already begun a shift in foreign policy priorities, taking a more liberal approach. Democracy promotion became a leading goal of U.S. foreign policy.⁽³¹⁾

Although it was a change in priority, it was still part of a long-term solution for winning the WOT. From here we can see that although there was a change coming from the Obama Administration, change was already taking place during the final years under Bush.

Both administrations wanted to capture OBL 'dead or alive' and bring him to justice.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Yet during the Bush Administration OBL began to be marginalised and was not considered 'a top priority use of American resources.'⁽³²⁾

Just six months after the attacks Bush stated that---

The idea of focusing on one person really indicates to me people don't understand the scope of the mission. Terror is bigger than one person. He's a person who's been marginalized. ...I really just don't spend that much time on him...⁽³³⁾

The Obama Administration revived this policy, pointing out throughout his 2008 campaign that his administration would work towards capturing and killing OBL since he was the biggest national security priority of the U.S. He was willing to do so at all costs.⁽⁴⁷⁾ It was a defining moment for the Obama presidency when he managed to fulfil this promise in 2011.

U.S. Foreign Policy and Relations with Pakistan: Strategy towards Pakistan



When it came to fighting the war, both administrations considered Pakistan as of vital importance, especially when it came to their objectives in Afghanistan. However, their strategy towards the country differed.

It can be said that the Bush Administration lacked a clear strategy for Pakistan. Bush got distracted with Iraq, therefore losing focus on the threat in Pakistan. This allowed the Taliban and al-Qaeda to find sanctuary and rebuild itself in the tribal areas of Pakistan after they were chased out of Afghanistan. On the other hand, the Obama Administration knew that the real threat to the U.S. was found in Pakistan and Afghanistan. As a result, it reoriented the war back to where it believed it belonged, leading to the creation of the Af-Pak strategy. This meant putting more focus on Pakistan when compared to the Bush Administration. ⁽³⁴⁾

As part of this strategy, it also appointed a Special Envoy to Afghanistan and Pakistan, showing the importance it was giving to the region. The Pakistani's were not too keen on the Af-Pak strategy. They especially resented the term since it put them on the same level with Afghanistan. They disagreed with this since according to them Afghanistan is a smaller country with a destabilised government, unlike itself.

Certain Bush Administration strategic principles have been embraced by the Obama Administration in the case of Pakistan. This includes the Administration's campaign of drone strikes against terrorists in the tribal areas and Afghan border region of Pakistan. Under both administrations this strategic doctrine was considered as the pre-emptive use of force. Yet one can

say that such a campaign was greatly increased and intensified under Obama. Drone strikes under the Obama Administrations' first term were six times more than those which were done under Bush's two terms. ⁽³⁵⁾

Both administrations emphasised the use of aid and assistance as a part of its foreign policy since they both strived to have a stable Pakistan in order to be able to cooperate in the war. However, they differed on the kind of aid they were providing Pakistan.

In eight years the Bush Administration transferred approximately \$10 billion to Pakistan which mainly focused on military aid and assistance. Aid was given for counterterrorism efforts and border security, therefore in order to achieve counter-terror objectives rather than internally strengthen Pakistan. In the eyes of Obama, such aid was useless since he believed that the money was not going towards eliminating al-Qaeda. To the contrary, al-Qaeda was growing in Pakistan and the rest of the world. In fact, Musharraf had openly admitted that such aid was being used for its own security interests, which included war with India and supporting certain militants.

Upon taking office, the Obama Administration wanted to change the kind and the way aid was being given. It continued to provide military and defence aid, however Obama stated that 'a campaign against extremism will not succeed with bullets or bombs alone.' ⁽³⁶⁾

The administration therefore gave much focus on non-military aid which was to support democracy and commit to stability in the country. Aid under Obama also differed from his predecessor since it included conditionality. This



meant giving more importance to accountability and in order to avoid such aid and assistance from being misused as was previously done.

The Bush and Obama Administration's had a difficult task of eliminating terrorists in Pakistan whilst respecting the country's sovereignty at the same time. Both dealt with accusations of violating Pakistani sovereignty through their use of drones. However, the issue of violating their sovereignty came out to a greater extent under Obama. Not only did his administration increase the use of drones in the country, but it has been argued that adding conditionality to aid meant interfering in Pakistani affairs and that it breached the country's sovereignty by raiding OBL's compound on Pakistani soil without its consent. This proves to be problematic for Obama when taking into consideration his Cairo speech where he openly stated that the U.S. would 'defend itself, respectful of the sovereignty of nations and the rule of law.'⁽³⁷⁾

When it came to the India-Pakistan dispute, although it appeared that there was going to be a shift in the way the issue was going to be dealt with if Obama were to be elected, there seems to have been continuity. Both administrations have given great focus on the resolution of the conflict between India and Pakistan and normalizing their relations. This was in order to ensure peace and security in the region and to eliminate the global threats of terrorism and nuclear arms which both countries possessed. With regards to Pakistan, it was important for both administrations that there would be resolution in order for the country to be an effective partner to the U.S. in Afghanistan since skirmishes with India were a distraction.⁽³⁸⁾

It has been evident that Pakistan's bilateral relationship with the U.S. has shifted from being a strong ally under Bush to the deterioration of relations under Obama. Following the 9/11 attacks, the third engagement between the U.S. and Pakistan began. During its two terms in office, the Bush Administration strived to keep Pakistan on its side. Not only did it give it large amounts of aid and assistance, but it even embraced the military rule of General Musharraf. It turned a blind eye to Musharraf's undemocratic ways because it believed that the military regime was keeping Pakistan stable. The administration wanted to avoid conflict with Pakistan as much as possible, and focused on maintaining cooperation between the two. In fact, under Bush they enjoyed good bilateral relations, with Pakistan being considered a strong ally in the WOT, and taking on the status of a MNNA.

However, the relations between the two countries soured under Obama. From the beginning, the administration had been sceptical as to how much Pakistan was a true ally. Although it wanted to maintain the cooperation the two countries enjoyed under the previous administration, Obama was ready to risk military confrontation with Pakistan if needs be. Prior to being elected he had made it clear that if the U.S. were to have any valuable information and Pakistan was unwilling or unable to act, it would do so itself. This indicated the shift of relations which were to happen.

Unlike its predecessor, the Obama Administration was unwilling to support military rule in Pakistan. However, at times, the Obama Administration did recognise the dominant role the Pakistani military played in the country. The



administration emphasised the importance of improving the political situation in Pakistan in order for it to be more successful in dealing with terrorism.

Yet in a few years bilateral relations between the two managed to deteriorate under Obama. This has been a result of various factors and events which have occurred and been mentioned previously. These include the increase of drone strikes which are killing more civilians and were allegedly unauthorised, the capture of OBL on Pakistani soil without its consent, the Admiral Mullen accusations, the AfPak strategy and the NATO airstrikes which killed Pakistani soldiers, amongst other reasons.

President Obama had based his 2008 presidential campaign on the idea of bringing about change for the U.S. However, following this comparative analysis it is evident that in the area of foreign policy there has been much continuity from the Bush to Obama Administration. In fact, much of the change in foreign policy which seemed to have appeared to be happening under Obama, was in fact already occurring under the Bush Administration, such as the increase of troops in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of troops in Iraq.

When it came to the foreign policy of the U.S. to Pakistan and its relations with the country, although there has been continuity in certain aspects, one can say that overall there has been a change in their bilateral relationship. Such continuity can be found in policies such as providing aid and assistance and the use of drones. However, the way the Obama Administration went about these policies and the introduction of a new strategy brought about some change.

Ultimately, this change has been reflected in the U.S.-Pakistan relationship which has worsened in the past years under the Obama Administration.

Conclusion

One can say that overall in substance there was little change in the foreign policy area. But when it came to the style of how to go about these policies, there has been some change which is evident in the case of bilateral relations with Pakistan. In other words, there has been change in continuity.

References:

1. Abdullah Azzam, al-Qaeda Al Sulbha, *Al Jihad*, principal journal of the Afghan Arabs, MAK, Peshawar, April 1988.
2. Transcript of Osama bin Laden Videotape, Mid-November 2001, transcript and annotations independently prepared by George Michael, translator, Diplomatic Language Services; and Dr. Kassem M. Wahba, Arabic language program coordinator, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. They collaborated on their translation and compared it with translations done by the US government for consistency. There were no inconsistencies in the translations.
3. Interview, former al-Qaeda member, London, July 2001.
4. Hugh Williamson, Jimmy Burns, Stephen Fidler and Mark Husband, 'A Catastrophic Failure of Intelligence', *Financial Times*, 29 Nov. 2001.



5. 'Bin Laden's Martyrs for the Cause', *Financial Times*, 28 Nov. 2001.
6. John K. Cooley, *Unholy Wars: Afghanistan, America and International Terrorism* (London: Pluto Press, 3rd edn, 2002), p. 41.
7. *Jane's World Insurgency and Terrorism* (Jan.-April 2000), p. 290.
8. Ibid.
9. Interview, former al-Qaeda member, London, Sept. 2001.
10. Tactical Interrogation Report of Mohommad Afroz, arrested on 2 Oct. 2001, Intelligence Bureau, New Delhi, India, p. 1.
11. Ibid., p. 2.
12. Abd-Al-Latif Al-Minawi, 'Egyptian Report: Terrorist Links', Cairo, *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat*, 8 Nov. 1998, p. 4.
13. Ibid., p. 3.
14. Muhammad Jamal Khalifa, Arrest in San Francisco
15. Ibid.
16. Based on estimates by military and civilian security and intelligence agencies and national police and law enforcement authorities, Feb. 2002.
17. Interview, al-Qaeda member, March 2001.
18. United States of America Versus Osama Bin Laden *et al.*, Court Reporters Office, Southern District of New York., Day 2 of the trial, 6 Feb. 2001, <http://cryptome.org/usa-v-ubl-dt.htm> and other sources.
19. Sean O'Neill, 'The Extremist Network That Sprang from "Londonistan"', *Daily Telegraph*, 3 Jan. 2002.
20. Peter Bergen, *Holy War, Inc, Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden* (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2001), pp. 1-6.
21. Dominic Kennedy, Daniel McGory, James Bone and Richard Ford, 'The Fingerprints of Terror', *The Times*, 24 Nov. 2001.
22. The Ladenese Epistle: Declaration of War (I) 2 Oct. 1996, MSA News (<http://msanews.mynet.net/MSANEWS/199610/19961012.3html>)
23. Kennedy *et al.*, 'Fingerprints of Terror'.
24. 'Man Says He Was Recruited by Bin Laden for Suicide Attack on US Embassy in Paris', Associated Press, 2 Oct. 2001.
25. USIS, New York, 7 Nov. 1998.
26. National Security Strategy (2010). p.11.
27. Baker, P. & Shanker, T., (2008). 'Obama Plans To Retain Gates At Defense Department.'
28. 'Barack Obama Orders 30,000 More Troops to Afghanistan.', BBC News. (2 December 2009)
29. Schmitt, E. & Shanker, T., (2008), 'Bush Administration Reviews its Afghanistan Policy, Exposing Points of Contention.'
30. Mason, R.C. (2009). 'U.S.-Iraq Withdrawal/Status of Forces Agreement: Issues for Congressional Oversight.' p.10.
31. Dimitrova, A. 'Obama's Foreign Policy: Between Pragmatic Realism and Smart Diplomacy?'



-
32. Lindsay, J.M. (2011). 'George W. Bush, Barack Obama and the Future of US Global Leadership'. p.770.
33. 'Bush: bin Laden "Wanted Dead or Alive".' CNN. (17 September 2001)
34. Seitz-Wald, A. (2011). 'Flashback: Bush on Bin Laden: 'I Really Just Don't Spend That Much Time On Him'.
35. Milne, D. (2012). 'Pragmatism or what? The Future of U.S. Foreign Policy.'
36. General Jone, J. (2009). 'President Obama's Afghanistan-Pakistan AfPak Strategy.'
37. Barack, O., 'Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on the Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan,' speech delivered at the Eisenhower Hall Theatre, United States Military Academy at West Point, West Point, New York, December 1, 2009
38. Jauhari, A. (2013). 'India-Pakistan Relations: International Implications.'