The United States – Pakistan Counter Terrorism Interaction & Distrust
(A Prospect of Drone Warfare 2004-2018)

Dr. Muhammad Iqbal Roy
Head,
Department of Political Science,
Govt. Murray College, Sialkot
Correspondence: roy.profpolscience1997@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Pakistan and the United States of America share a distinct strategic and diplomatic heritage with respect to issues primarily concerning security. During the Cold War period, both states developed comprehensive strategies against Communist threat which also included designing Afghanistan in a manner to protect anti-Communist structure but with dissolution of the Soviet Union, ground realities with respect to al-Qaeda and Taliban changed dramatically where America and Pakistan shared distinct points of view. The United States of America claimed Taliban to be prospectively dangerous and a threat to international security whereas Pakistan maintained that disturbing regional equilibrium was not feasible primarily. The 9/11 incident changed domain of security and regional integrity where both Pakistan and the United States were individually and collectively at a turbulent decision vacuum. United States of America was required to reevaluate its security matrix while Pakistan was to restructure its security calculus to accommodate asymmetric aggression. The Washington administration adopted areal drone strategy to knock-down al-Qaeda on its heels and to crush Taliban and other associate groups from Afghanistan and Northern areas of Pakistan. The logic of the use of unmanned drone technology argued by the Washington administration that the drones are highly affected and target killing weapons have been highly successful at killing of high value targets' (HVTs) in different countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen. The drone warfare is quite ethical, wise and essential to combat and kill the daunting and repulsive terrorist organizations in different parts of the world. The US drone strikes strategy during 2004-2018 over the territories of Pakistan has been severely criticize on the part of Pakistan's political, social, religious fabrics and media channels which generated anti-American sentiments in Pakistan and generated the environment of distrust between the United States and Pakistan. The research aims at defining the spectrum of terrorism and its various forms that can individually and collectively effect counter-terrorism and will also prospectively suggest amendments and ramifications of bilateral counterterrorism initiative between America and Pakistan. The work focuses on presenting effects of standalone strategies on the overall policy of reducing effect of terrorism on a global scale by presenting a comprehensive timeline of America-Pakistan interaction pertaining to

counterterrorism. The purpose of postulating such a comprehensive timeline is to present a compendium of fault lines and opportunity orientations for America and Pakistan to consider while engaging in a bilateral counterterrorism stratagem.

Keywords: *Pakistan-United States, Drone Attacks, The 9/11 incidents, Areal Drone Technology, High Value Targets (HVTs), Al-Qaeda, TTP, Durand Line, Counter-Terrorism, Non-Combatants, Trust Deficit*

The Doctrine of Aerial Drone Warfare

The unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) known as drones is an important invention of 21st century in the field of war technology. The tactics of drone warfare have become the most effective strategy used by the United States, particularly after the 9/11 attacks on its own soil. The US counter terrorism and security authorities decided to launch drone technology against the militants of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban; another associated terrorist organization based in Afghanistan. Although the United States has used drone technology in Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia but Pakistan as a non-NATO ally in the war against terrorism has been victimized by the drone attacks with the more civilian casualties and less targets. The United States adopted the drone strategy as a key determinant of its war on terror policy to hunt and kill Al-Qaeda's hidden leadership in Pakistan. The drone warfare has been conceded as an important deterrent war technique rather than measures of conventional diplomacy and security .The principle of self-defense and the invention of the doctrine of preemptive strike have created legitimacy for the United States to use the drone technology against the perpetrators of global terrorism. The United States seeks the legitimacy to use of power in self-defense (Sarwar, Nadia, 2009). The drone strikes strategy of pentagon violated Pakistan's sovereign authority and caused serious concerns among the people and politicians of Pakistan. General Pervez Musharraf, the then president of Pakistan in 2004 gave permission to the United States for a few drone strikes and the then Prime Minister Yusuf Raza Gillani had no reservation towards the US drone attacks, as long as the drone hit the right people. The Islamabad administration even asked the United States to make drone attacks on the leadership of TTP (Sattar, 2013, p. 273).The public opinion has remained inactive about the drone strikes which targeted militants who were notorious terrorists throughout the years in Pakistan. But conflict arose due to collateral damage on innocent civilian, including school going children, working women and old age people. The Washington administration did not make any compensation for the victimized citizens of Pakistan. On the other hand, the Washington government claimed drone strikes were more indispensable and effective against the high value terrorists. The United States claimed to have killed thirty top cadres of Al-Qaeda and dismantled their network (Dawn, 2009, August 7). Thus the conflict of drone strikes disrupted Pakistan-US relations.

US Drone Warfare across the Durand Line

The United States adopted the doctrine of aerial drone technology against the suspected terrorists of Al-Qaeda, the Taliban and other terrorist organizations in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen. The US led drone campaigns are conducted by the CIA having little oversight of Congress, whereas most of the American people remain unaware of the intensity of effects and scale of the drone program operating in these countries along with its repulsive consequences and

implications. The UAVs targeted the areas like Hangu, Khyber Agency, North and South Waziristan in the Northern areas of Pakistan. The drone attacks killed hundreds including civilians and a few wanted militants of TTP and Al-Qaeda. The Washington administration occasionally has argued that drones are remarkably precise and limited in terms of collateral damage and are the only games in town in terms of dislocating the leadership of Al-Qaeda. The use of drone technology has made regions in Pakistan like PATA and FATA neither safe nor a 'haven' for al-Qaeda and its associated militant organizations.

The US drone strikes have knocked Al-Qaeda on its heels because of destruction of its network and death of several of its leading operatives. The US administration has repeatedly insisted that the drone strikes are ethical, wise and essential to perish the attacking terrorists in the remote regions (Boyle, 2013, pp. 4-5). The Washington administration has argued that the drones are highly effective target killing weapons and have been successful at killing of 'high value targets' (HVTs) and have the most beneficial tactics of countering militancy and terrorism. The acceleration of drone strikes in Pakistan has been criticized on the part of Pakistan's population, religio-political parties and media channels during 2005-2018. The US drone strategy over Pakistan's territory has weakened the government and added enemies to the ranks. It has been perceived that the Islamabad administration has become ineffective and powerless to stop drone attacks on its territory. Different political parties i.e. Jamat-e-Islami, Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) and PTI have severely criticized and declared the government as a crippled and incumbent regime in parliamentary debates. The social fabric of Pakistan has been affected quite adversely due to American drone policy towards Pakistan, and led the masses to come on the roads against anti-drone and anti-American demonstration.

Effects of WOT on the United States

The United States and its people have suffered a heavy cost of human and material loss against the WOT. A huge debt and declining standard of American people have put the US economy under a huge pressure and an increasing number of the Americans turned against the US involvement in the ongoing war against terrorism. Even the public has resorted to street demonstrations to register their anti-war protest in the street of America and the European states. The American economic infrastructure has been affected and foreign debt increased more than 100% of its annual economic output. The cost of war on terror during Bush regime was $864.82 billion, since 9/11 whereas the cost of war during Obama's first three years was $477 billion which was almost half the cost of that during Bush regime (Rana, Shehbaz, 2011).

The Economic Cost of WOT

After the awful terrorist attacks of 9/11, the Washington administration has to face different failures in the context of fighting war on terror. The United States spent 1 trillion$ since 2010 on Afghanistan and Iraq. The current annual cost of the United States reaches at 30 billion$ fighting against terrorism (Mazhar and Goraya, 2010). The United States have been affected and victimized its peace and security, due to launch of a worldwide campaign against terror which has challenged the global security. Almost 95 Americans banks have been locked and the people over 3

million people lost their jobs (Daily Jang, 2010 February 4). Robinson writes that, "It by no means made good judgment to believe of the fight against terrorism as a "war" since it is not doable to overwhelm and conquer a modus operandi or a plan by the power of weapon, according to him, George W Bush picked a path towards a more or less enduring situation of an expensive fatal low -level war. Barack Obama must have taken a diverse track" (Gorvachev, 2010, October 28). The budget of US domestic security, external defense and military affairs increased 50% from $354 to $547 billion and it was an excessive amount that the United States cost of its homeland security since 1950's (9/11 Commission report 2004, p. 378).

American Counterterrorism Strategy and its Effects on Global Politics

The US led global war on terror has widened the gap between the west and the Muslim world. The WOT has also enhanced anti-western and anti-American sentiments in Muslim society and created a worldwide western perception of Islam as an extremist and pro militants ideology. The international media have played a vital role to amplify the distance between the Western and Muslim world through the projection of Islam as the region of sponsoring militancy, fanaticism and extremism (Niaz, 2011, P. 63).

Social Effect of American Counterterrorism on Pakistan

The negation fundamental rights, freedom and liberty of the citizens of Muslim world have been marginalized in the aftermath of 9/11 across the Muslims world and the Pakistanis have been victimized by obligation to have photographs fingerprints and other essentials of scrutiny, entry and exit registration system monitored by the security agencies. A thousand of Pakistani nationals have to pay an amount $ 900for hiring taxis, as they are afraid of riding a bus, that would be spotted and detained. Denial of civil liberties and extradition of 11,000 Pakistani's were their other concerns (Hukill, 2003, March 26).

Impact on American National Security

The 9/11 carnage and the US counter terrorism strategy against war on terror proved to be a vague deal as the guerilla warfare and insurgency jeopardized the sovereign nation states and their national security. The threat of terrorism spread from one corner to another, from war prone zone to the adjoining states in the rest of the world (Gunaratna & Iqbal, 2011, P.17). Another blame game of associating terrorism appeared to practice between the pro-western and pro terrorist factions in the world politics (Singh 2006 P.576). The United States has paid the heavy cost of psychological, social, and economic loss which has made quite cumbersome conditions (Stohl, 2008).

Psychological Cost of Terrorism: Institutional Repercussions

The American military personnel soldiers have been fighting wars in Afghanistan have been severely suffered, victimized and sacrificed and 17% of them have become addicted to anxiety medication (Notte, 2009, March 17). Moreover, the conflict stricken areas of the world have to face a high rate of somatic disorder. There have been different indirect effects of trauma due to the war and its aftermaths i.e. political instability, poverty, economic crises, unemployment and disintegration of social support system (Cardoz, Bilukha, et.al, 2004, P. 292).The

US led NATO forces got disappointment over its failure to eliminate the resultant toughest resistance of the local groups for it had to face the loss of lives of its soldiers bringing about a huge material setback. The states of the European Union states and NATO countries have to face a serious financial crisis.

The Use of Drone against Pakistan

The United States had first time used UAVs against Pakistan in 2004. The number of drone attacks has climbed over the years to 38 in 2008, 52 in 2009 and 132 in 2010. There have been about 300 drone attacks identified since June 17, 2004. The frequency of drone attacks raised one strike after every four days. John O. Brennan, President Obama's leading counter terrorism advisor stated in June 2011 that for almost a year "there hasn't been a single collateral death because of the exceptional proficiency, precision of the capabilities, we have been able to develop." But other CIA officials claimed that the drones have killed more than 600 militants and not a single noncombatant (New York Times, 2011, October 21).Inside Pakistan public and political opinion has been developed, that the drone strikes caused collateral damage in Pakistan. The United States carried on over 250 drone strikes during 2009 to 2013 that caused more than 3,000 civilian casualties and the Washington administration did not offer the compensation of the victimized. Despite the parliament of Pakistan and officials demand to cease drone attacks inside the Pakistan, the United States continued to perceive that the drone attack strategy was an effective tool against the high value terrorists. The Washington administration also claimed that the predator strikes inside Pakistan helped to disrupt and nurture the network of Al-Qaeda and Haqqani Group and killed almost top thirty leaders of these terrorist organizations (Sattar, Abdul, 2013, p. 273).The drone debate led to disruption of Pakistan-US relations on the conflict of collateral damage in Pakistan. Another question which arose in the social and political circles of Pakistan was that the drone warfare had violated Pakistan's state sovereignty. There was enhancement of anti-US elements and enhanced public resentment against the Washington administration and Pakistan for supporting America's use of drone. The US administration made it clear to Pakistan that General Pervez Musharraf , the then President of Pakistan and Yusuf Raza Gillani, then the Prime Minister that he had no objections to the use of drone technology against the targeted al-Qaeda and TTP's activists. The Islamabad administration even asked Washington to make use of drones against the hideouts of TTP leadership (Sanger, 2012, p. 259).The US unmanned missile strikes in the tribal areas of Pakistan have remained a controversial issue and a bone of contention between Pak-US relations during 2004 to 2013.The intermittent drone strikes by the United States have killed thousands of the civilians and have led the terrorist groups to induct more militants who started to attack Pakistan's security forces and continued suicidal explosions throughout Pakistan. A drone strike on an elder local Jirga in North Waziristan killed forty four people on May 3rd 2011. The local Jirga incident once again made the situation of security, uncertain and sensitive dividing public opinion. The Pakistan-US relationship once again was disrupted (Ali, 2013, p. 151).

The Washington administration believed that drone warfare as an expansion of its counter terrorism strategy to kill the targeted Al-Qaeda and Taliban terrorists and to destruct their sanctuaries in northern areas of Pakistan. The predator and reaper

UAVs have been killing thousands of innocent Pakistani civilians including school children, working peasants and women at homes.

Targets of the Non-Combatants: Over 90% of the target casualties caused by drone attacks belong to noncombatants. The drone attacks have turned the situation of human rights in Pakistan more cumbersome as "the next Guantanamo." "It is estimated that as many as over 3,000 people have been killed by the US drones in Pakistan since 2004. Of these casualties hardly 40 people were said to be of high value targets. Every month the drone operators are given a list of targets, but it is unclear how those names are gathered (Saleem & Goraya, 2011, p. 197). The conflict of drone attacks between Pakistan and the United States deteriorated their bilateral relations when the CIA drone hit DittaKhel a local jirga in May 2011 that has killed over forty civilian people just after the release of Raymond Davis, a former US army soldier and CIA contractor.

Serious Concerns over US Spy Networks: The Pakistan's army establishment has shown its serious concern over the US spy network in the Federally Administrated Area of Pakistan. Moreover the Islamabad administration demanded to transfer the drone technology to Pakistan so that it could itself eliminate the militants and destroy the hideouts of terrorists while operating on its western borders.

Pakistan's Socio Political Perception: The United States has its own geostrategic and regional interests that go side by side with Indian and Israeli interests according to a wide ranged sociopolitical perception in Pakistan.

Drone Strikes and their effects: The war on terror has been affected due to drone strikes as an added source of hostility between the two allied states fighting a common war against global terror. The rise of drone attacks in Pakistan has increased the toll of deaths which ultimately imprint negative effects not only on the bilateral relations but also accelerate a strong reaction from tribal areas. The use of predator drones can undermine Chinese investment in Pakistan as a huge blow to Pakistan's tumbling economy due to uncertain social and political environment. Consequently, most of the Chinese investment in this area mainly around the Gwadar seaport like transport links between Gwadar and Quetta, oil pipeline connecting the port to China's western areas can become susceptible owing to drone strikes (Mir, 2010, p. 178).

Threat to Lives: The people of Pakistan's federal and provincial administrated tribal areas feel threatened for their lives and perceive the drone warfare as a great menace to the solidarity, security and integration of Pakistan.

Domestic Repercussions: There are several domestic repercussions that have been generated by the use of CIA drone warfare technique in Pakistan. The use of UAVs has largely been perceived in Pakistan as a violation of state's sovereignty and international law. It is an illusion and failure in winning the hearts and minds of the people in Pakistan and abroad. The increasing death toll of innocent civilians giving air to the militants has become more reactionary and has left psychological illness. The drone warfare has traumatized Pakistan's socioeconomic life and let it on the verge of becoming a failed state. The inflation, crisis of unemployment frustration, hopelessness, intolerance, extremism and increase of militancy are the other major fall out of the drone attacks in Pakistan.

The United States – Pakistan Counter Terrorism Interaction & Distrust
(A Prospect of Drone Warfare 2004-2018)

Table 1

Drone Attacks in Pakistan: 2004-2018

Year	Incidents	Killed	Injured
2004	1	8	1
2005	1	1	0
2006	0	0	0
2007	1	20	15
2008	19	156	17
2009	46	536	75
2010	90	831	85
2011	59	548	52
2012	46	344	37
2013	24	158	29
2014	22	145	53-76
2015	10	57	25-32
2016	3	9	3-6
2017	8	39	1-5
2018	1	1-3	0
Total*	284	2581	296

Source: http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/pakistan/database/Droneattack.htm

The Element of Mutual Trust Deficit

Pakistan's counter terrorism strategy lacks a tangible scheme plan and works on temporary norms. Pakistan has adopted an incident to incident approach and has remained quite inclusive in the context of its several military operations during 2001 to 2013. Pakistan's policy of dialogue and cease fire with Taliban has also been severely criticized by international community, authorities and statesmen. Pakistan's policy of differentiating faction of Taliban as good and bad Taliban, local and international Taliban has not led Pakistan to uproot the homegrown terrorist network. Thus Pakistan's poor and weaker plans for dealing with the militants made international security vulnerable and kept the role of the National Crisis Management Cell (NCMC) and the NACTA ineffective and limited. Pakistan's multilayered counter terrorism policies without having any inter agency task force and operational wing remained in the doldrums of decision making. Moreover, Pakistani authorities had not learnt any lesson from the policies of other states, i.e. Australia, Canada, Germany, Turkey, UK and the United States in the wake of continual and sporadic terrorist attacks on its soil. Pakistan could not establish an indigenous anti-terrorism research center and a coherent approach to combat the evils of sectarian violence, religious extremism, intolerance, suicidal explosions and other acts of terrorism. The study reveals that Pakistan still adheres with weak and compromised law enforcement sector, lacking of research oriented counter terrorism policy, ideological differences in the decision making circles, absence of true assessment of the terrorist incidents, irrational and biased interrogation, multiplicity of counter terrorism players, absence of inter-agency task force, a compact anti-terrorism operational wing, ineffective NCMC and NACTA, untrained and unequipped police force and lack for full cooperation by the international community for eliminating the scourge of terrorism. The co-operation and divergence between the United States and Pakistan remained as an important factor of the counter terrorism strategy during 2008-2013. The Kerry-Lugar legislation, restoration of US-Pakistan dialogue diplomacy, Raymond Davis issue, (Jan 2011) operation Geronimo (May 2011) and killing of the most wanted man Osama bin Laden, the Mehran base attack (May 2011), the Salala check post

attack (Nov 2011), the Memo gate scandal (Oct 2011) are the major sporadically developments which have kept the United States- Pakistan relations under the clouds. Pakistan continued to apply the option of military operations during Zardari regime. The PPP government adopted a very clear stance in opposition to al Qaeda Taliban and other terrorist elements in Pakistan. Consequently Taliban bitterly opposed to the PPP and made it difficult to launch 2013 election campaign openly in the country. Despite such tedious circumstances the PPP government initiated different military operations in Swat and Southern Waziristan. Some short ranged and minor military operations were conducted in other agencies in Northern areas of Pakistan. However terrorism remained as a potent threat to Pakistan during 2008-2013 due to certain factors of its ineffective counter terrorism strategy. Pakistan's counter terrorism policy included its strategic interests in the region engaging the militant jihadi groups in Kashmir cause (as the strategic assets). Pakistan's counter terrorism policy has been undermined by the skewed civil military relations. An ongoing civil military tussle jeopardized the efficacy of Islamabad's counter terrorism agenda. The absence of consensual narrative in the society of Pakistan weather the war on terror is a war of the United States or a common global cause for lasting peace and stability. Pakistan and the United States will have to be engaged with one another, co-operate where it is possible and adopt dialogue diplomacy to reduce differences and doubts in their bilateral relations in the context of countering terrorism.

Implications on Pakistan

The prolonged war on terror particularly the US aerial drone strategy against Pakistan during 2004-2018 has contributed to

- The use of American drone warfare caused political instability, anarchy and socio-economic problems in the tribal areas of Pakistan in particular and in the rest of Pakistan in general.

- The law enforcing agencies of Pakistan have been facing great difficulty in the perspective of legislation related to the legal status of the US drone strikes in the northern areas of Pakistan.

- Another major effect was that the religious, political parties came on the same page regarding the wave of anti-Americanism in Pakistan.

- Muthida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA) an alliance of religio-political parties won a large number of seats in the national and the provincial assemblies of KPK and Balochistan as the reaction of American drone policy in the northern areas of Pakistan.

- Different political regimes in Pakistan during 2004-2018 have to accept the option of American drone strikes that killed and injured thousands of people in the Northern tribal belt of Pakistan. On the whole almost over 140,000 Pakistani troops have been deployed to fight against the militants in the northern areas of Pakistan adjoining the Durand line (Thakur, 2012, p.89).

- The state and society of Pakistan have to face number of other problems, including that of ethnicity, sectarian violence, hatred, ineffectiveness of police, suicidal attacks, wide spread evil of corruption, poverty and hunger

and tumbling economic infrastructure and severe financial crises as the outcome of US drone warfare inside Pakistan.

- Back tracking of Pakistan's economy and politics due to a rising proportion of poverty, inflation, unemployment, energy crises, power shortage and the lack of essential funds have jolted the governance and statecraft of Pakistan.

- A strong public disapproval and growing anti-American sentiments among the people of Pakistan has increased due to the death of 3097 civilians and military personnel during 2004-2018. (Gunaratna, 2011, pp. 255-256).

- The distressing aspect of all the sacrifices made by the people of Pakistan is that there seems to be no end to the evil of terrorism, increases feelings of insecurity, stress and uncertainty in the social and political circle of Pakistan. The entire population of Pakistan is living under perpetual threat and horror of terrorism and suicidal attacks. (The Nation 2012 October 9).

Repercussions for Pakistan Counter Terrorism Policy

Pakistan has to give up the traditional conventional, dubious and multifaceted counter terrorism strategy because the modern concept of security has been changed. Islamabad needs to apply a coherent policy making spectrum of inter-state co-operation and a strong punitive network to eliminate the interest, activities and destroy the sanctuaries of terrorist organizations like TTP, al-Qaeda while accomplishing the US drone warfare against the targeted enemy. Pakistan and the United States have defined and determined their specific interests and policy preferences in the changing dynamics of international security environment but yet a strong, influential, trustworthy intelligence information system required among the nations fighting against terror. The strict surveillance of mobile and internet network, anti-terrorist legislation, an effective judicial prosecution of the terrorist on the part of Islamabad against the internal and external threats of terrorism will strengthen the future US-Pakistan relations as the requisites of countering terrorism. Contrary to Pakistan the United States has applied its counter terrorism strategy through an organized, coherent and the broader spectrum to understand the root causes, rudimentary and secondary ingredients involved sponsoring the global terrorism. The United States has established a comprehensive mechanism to assess the aims, objectives and mindset of the terrorists who are engaged in promoting of global terrorism. The Washington administration has fully concentrated on all the possible options of legal, social, political, economic, administrative and cultural reforms along with military actions and operations including the strategy of drone warfare which proved helpful to eradicate all kind of terrorist activities. The sporadic paradigm shift in Pakistan's counter terrorism strategy has created distrust, strain and critical situation for the United States and global mechanism of countering terrorism. On the whole there has been cooperation and divergence between the United States and Pakistan fighting against the scourge of terrorism, the application of counter terrorism strategies, particularly the use of aerial drone warfare and difference of opinion what is, when is and where is to be done at a particular time, what should be the priorities of do more against the militants or economic and military assistance from both Pakistan and United States have generated periodic strains in the bilateral relations during the years 2004-2018.

Conclusion

The doctrine of areal drone warfare adopted by the United States against the targeted terrorists organizations like TTP and al-Qaeda along with their associated groups in Afghanistan and the Northern areas of Pakistan. The CIA conducted the drone campaigns even having the little oversight of the US Congress and the American people who remain unaware of the intensity of the consequences of the drone program operating across the Durant Line. The Northern areas of Pakistan like Hangu, Khyber Agency, North and South Waziristan have been targeted through off and on operational strategy. Since 2004-2018 over 3000 people including non-combatants civilians, working women, children killed by the drone attacks. The Washington administration presented its justified arguments that areal drones are remarkably précised and limited in terms of collateral damage. Furthermore the sole purpose to strike with drone technology is to dislocate the leadership of al-Qaeda and to destroy their sanctuaries. Therefore the United States reportedly insisted that drone attacks are ethical, wise and essential to crush the attacking terrorists in the targeted regions across the Pak-Afghan borders. On the other hand the acceleration of drone attacks inside the territory of Pakistan has to face a severe and countrywide criticism in Pakistan from all the social, religious and political quarters led by the media channels. The American drone strategy inside the territory of Pakistan has created certain effects that is socio-political and economic stability, popular political demonstration and the protest of religious and political parties including anti- American debates in the parliament of the Pakistan. Consequently the social fabric of Pakistan has been affected quite adversely to the US drone policy towards Pakistan that generated anti-American sentiments throughout the country. Pakistan has to face a huge economic cost physiological and traumatic social disorder, widening of distrust and misunderstanding between Islamabad and the Washington administration. There is a dire need to develop cooperative arrangements between the US and Pakistan counter terrorism joint ventures. The trust building through institutional bilateralism is an essential factor to uproot the perpetrators of anti-state terrorist activities. A comprehensive and cooperative counter terrorism mechanism is required to legitimize the actual and targeted use of the US drone technology with the full consent and participation of Pakistan's security forces and political regime.

References

[1] Ali, Z. (2013). Pak- US relations in post 9/11 era. In Iram Khalid (Ed.).*Pakistan foreign policy evolution, development and strategies.* (pp. 137-175). Lahore: Peace Publications.

[2] Boyle, M. J. (2013). *The costs and consequences of drone warfare*. Monthly current affairs, book 225, May 2013. Lahore: A.H. Publishers.

[3] Cardoz, B. L. Bilikha, O. O. Crawford, C. A. G. Shaikh, I. Wolfe, M. I. & Gerber, M. L. (2004). Mental health, social functioning and disability in post war Afghanistan. *The Journal of American Medical Association*, *292*(5), 575-584. Retrieved from
http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=199195

[4] Daily Jang, (2010, February 4). Retrieved from https://jang.com.pk/

[5] Dawn, (2009, May 7).Retrieved from https://www.dawn.com/

[6] Gorvachev, M. (2010, May 11). Website, America risking another Vietnam in Afghanistan. Retrieved from http://rt.com/politics/gorvachev-afghanistan-interview-america/

[7] Gunaratna, R. & Iqbal, Khurram. (2011). Pakistan Terrorism Ground Zero, London: Reaktion Books Limited.

[8] Gunaratna, R. &Iqbal, K. *Pakistan: Terrorism ground zero*. London, LDN: Reaktion Books (Ltd.).

[9] Hukill, T. (March 26, 2003). A Safe Haven Turns Hostile. Retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/story/15480/a_safe_haven_turnshostile/?.page=4

[10] Mazhar, M. S. & Goraya, N. S. (2011). Drone war against Pakistan: An analytical study. *Journal of Political Studies*, *18*(2) 187-206**.**

[11] Mazhar, M. S., & Goraya. N. S. (2010). America's new Afghan or Pakistan policy. *South Asian studies, 25*(1), 39-64.

[12] Mir, N. (2010). *Gwadar on the global chessboard: Pakistan's identity, history and culture*. Lahore: Ferozsons (Pvt) Ltd.

[13] New York Times. (2011, October 21). Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/

[14] Niaz, U. (2011). *Wars, insurgencies and terrorist attacks: A psychological perspective from the Muslim world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[15] Notte, J. (March 17, 2009). *Soldiers committing suicide: US troops are killing themselves*. Retrieved from http://thephoenix.com/boston/news/78044-soldiers-committingsuicide/.

[16] Rana, S. (2011, March 20). Myth vs reality: US aid to Pakistan dwarf erred by economic cost of war. *The Express Tribune*. Retrieved from https://tribune.com.pk/

[17] Rocca, Christina, Assistant Secretary for South Asian Affairs. (2004). "Statement on the Recommendations of 9/11 Commission Report on August 19. Before the House International Committee Washington D.C. http://www.state.gov/p/sa/rls/rm/35611.htm

[18] Sanger, D. E. (2012). *Confront and conceal*. New York, NY: Crown Publishers.

[19] Sarwar, N. (2009). *US drone attacks inside Pakistan territory: UN Charter. Reflections. (3) Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad*. Retrieved from http://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/1299220448_287937.pdf

[20] Sattar, A. (2013). *Pakistan's foreign policy 1947-2012: A concise history*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

[21] Sattar, A. (2013). *Pakistan's foreign policy 1947-2012: A concise history*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

[22] Singh, K. R. (2006). *Indian Ocean: Great power interventions*. New Delhi: Independent Publishing Company.

[23] Thakhur, R. (2012). A Changing Chess Board: The New Grate Game in Afghanistan and Global Asia. *A Journal of the East Asia Foundation*. Seoul. www.globalasia.org

[24] The Nation. (October 9, 2012). https://nation.com.pk/