

Terrorism: A Challenge of Pakistan’s Foreign Policy and Way Forward

Nabila Akhtar

Assistant Professor of Political Science, Govt Graduate Rabia Basri College (W), Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: n.ravian.1971@gmail.com

Qamar Fatima

Associate Professor of Political Science, Got APWA College for Women, Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: qamarfatima5@gmail.com

Syeda Phool Zahra

Lecturer in History & Ph.D. Scholar, Township College for Women, Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: phoolzahra@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Terrorism is a complex phenomenon of today’s world. By implication, it entails violence, threat and designs to generate fear in the targets. This phenomenon has crossed the borders across the regions and further extended to the states, which by historical, political, ethnic, racial commonalties, geographical compulsions or political circumstances interlocked into a situation to provide moral, material, logistical support for freedom and independence movements. Pakistan is facing the acute consequences of this type of enigmatic situation. Pakistan is having a paradoxical situation and terrorism in a real sense has become a foreign policy challenge. Its foreign policy and National Security Policy merged in terms of objectives, tools, targets and instruments. Pakistan’s strategic priorities in South Asia to have a friendly government in Afghanistan, resolve Kashmir issue in line with the desires of Kashmiris, division plan of subcontinent of 1947 and General Assembly Resolutions of 1948, led it to use some non- state actors or internationally labelled organizations in Kashmir and Afghanistan. This study has evaluated the menace of terrorism as a foreign policy challenge with special reference to Pakistan as a case study. For this purpose, some questions were formulated and a determined effort has been made to find out the answers. The descriptive, historical and analytical standpoints were undertaken during the course of research. A way forward has also been suggested to rectify the Lacunas and negative aspersions cast by the international community.

Keywords: **Terrorism, Foreign Policy, National Security, Non-state Actors, Strategy**

Introduction

A nation state interacts with other states through foreign policy choices. Foreign policy choices are usually outcomes of the geopolitical environment of the state, determined by the factors stemming from the influences of geography, economics, and technology along with security hazards. In South Asia, Pakistan since its inception has been fraught into the quagmire of problems due to the factors springing from the geopolitical environment of the region. It is located at the crossroad of three very important regions of the world, signifying its relevance in

the different strands of international politics. If we see on the map, the oil rich Gulf States are on West, in the Northwest are the republics of Central Asia, with gigantic economic potentials of energy resources and to the East lie the vastness of Far East Asia. This diversity while posturing a challenge, also gives great strength to the country.

So, the United States after surfacing up as a super power from the debris of World War II viewed South Asia as a prospective play field for the future superpower rivalry. Pakistan during the pinnacle period of ideological confrontation between communism and capitalism was swathed with the frontline state status, then forthcoming events after the end of cold war and with the dawn of counterterrorism era, once again made it a frontline state with a deep repercussions of acts of terrorism and effects of counterterrorism measures making it a challenge of foreign policy.

In this situation foreign policy becomes more complicated when analysed the unique nature of the circumstances in the case of Pakistan. Hostility on Eastern & western borders, large population, strong religious beliefs divided into sects, the weak economy and a lead role in Afghan conflict with the then USSR and now in the war against terrorism have made foreign policy formulation very challenging. The use of non-state actors in sponsoring terrorism as a tool of foreign policy to achieve political objectives have been an established practice and used by the states in the past particularly by super powers during the cold war period. But now the involvement of the non-state actors for the furtherance of the foreign policy objectives is posing threat to the regional and international peace. Unfortunately, Pakistan has been alleged as a state sponsoring terrorism in other countries mainly India and Afghanistan. This poses a threat of isolation of Pakistan in the community of nations.

Further, in the absence of a consensus and accepted definition of terrorism, some countries and nations do not endorse the western view and insist that freedom fighters cannot be equated with terrorists. Pakistan is one of those which consider use of state and non-state actors (Kashmir & Afghanistan) a legitimate tool of foreign policy goals and objectives.

The scope of study includes an understanding of terrorism, which in a real sense has been and still is a foreign policy challenge. So there is a need to comprehend the issue of terrorism through the perspective of foreign policy and by focusing upon the circumstances in which Pakistan has to choose the option of using non-state actors as foreign policy proxies. The objective of this paper is to find out the menace of terrorism as a foreign policy challenge.

Research Questions

1. How terrorism puts Pakistan in the quagmire of problems in terms of foreign policy objectives?
2. How it instrumented in creating an isolation paradox for Pakistan?

Terrorism: A Challenge of Pakistan's Foreign Policy and Way Forward

The approach adopted in this paper is descriptive, analytical and critical; relying mainly on secondary and qualitative data given in the scope of the study. The paper is organized into three distinct sections. Section 1 develops the conceptual frame section 2 is about the issue of terrorism in Pakistan, section 3 is about terrorism as a foreign policy challenge and resulting isolation paradox which Pakistan is facing due to its policy though undeclared of using militant organization as foreign policy proxies.

Section I

Foreign Policy and Terrorism: A Concept

“No foreign policy-no matter how genius-has any chance of success if it is born in the minds of a few and carried in the hearts of none” (Henry A. Kissinger).

The foreign policymaking is a dynamic process with essentialities of objectives, principles and challenges, which usually remain unchanged. Here a pertinent question arises that why these of essentialities of foreign policy remain unchanged? The answer unveils some factors that are fixed and stable. However, experts identify some other determinants which are flexible in nature with a secondary role in shaping a country's foreign policy. In the words of George Modelski:

“The system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment”

In the words of Rodee, Anderson and Chrystal:

“Foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of the principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect its future interest” (Gibson, 1944).

Broadly speaking, Foreign Policy is based and grounded in the unique historical background, political Institutions, traditions, economic needs, power factors, aspirations, peculiar geographical circumstances, and basic set of values of a nation. So, in this backdrop, we can categorize the factors and determinants of Foreign Policy under the rubrics of geography, economic developments, political institutions, domestic milieu, international milieu, military strength and national character (Rizvi, 1993). History proves that the role of leadership has overwhelmed the other factors in making foreign policy decisions. In the last but not least comes international environment which cast the direct impact on the foreign policies of states. International regional environment always remains a

source of security threat of a country. Pakistan is no exception in terms of essentialities of Foreign policy and challenges, with all vulnerabilities of security threats emanating from international and regional environments.

Defining Terrorism

The word terror a derivative of Greek *Terrere* means “to frighten” has been used with varied meaning and purposes. When it comes to debate as a concept of Terrorism, it lacks a consensual definition. This concept has been used in a variety of contexts, from the period of despot the Ivan terrible to eras of political turmoil of reign of terror during the French Revolution, to the present day use of force and violence against innocent people under the rubric of International terrorism. So far as the issue of definition is concerned, the author of the *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla* defines terrorism as an “an action the urban guerrilla must execute with the greatest cold bloodedness, calmness and decisions” (Marghella, 2011). Despite of all disagreement, a middle ranged definition has been sought by the US Department of State in the words: “terrorism is a predetermined, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non- combatants targets by clandestine state agents, usually intended to influence an audience” (Ribicoff, 1979). This explanation surfaced up in the mid-1980s, but with the 9/11 incident, the US perspective has changed by recognizing that not all terrorists are state agents, but many are adherents and affiliates of groups or organizations that often act with the assistance of state agents. This definition is not widely accepted because now a sense prevails all across the globe that this definition has a blurred version. It equates freedom fighters and terrorists. The nationalities struggling for the freedom of their motherland like Palestinians and Kashmiris tend to reject this explanation of terrorism. The types of terrorism are also multifarious generally linked with the purpose of terrorism. The Encyclopedia Britannica describes the following types: Revolutionary terrorism, sub- revolutionary Terrorism, Establishment terrorism, Nationalists, religious Terrorism, religious terrorism, inter-state or International terrorism, group terrorism, State- sponsored Terrorism.

In this category, states are claimed to use the hidden groups to suppress anti state or anti-government elements. Now these groups are used as foreign policy tools as Hoffman describes it, “a cost effective way of waging war covertly through the use of surrogate warriors or guns for hire” (Michael, 2007). This is the most controversial type which has become in the real sense, around the world, a foreign policy challenge especially for Pakistan.

Menace of Terrorism and Pakistan: an Issue in the Offing

As stated earlier, Foreign policy is made by the countries to achieve their national interests with fixed and variable factors and determinants to change the behaviour of other states and respond to the international environment. The fundamentals of foreign policy of Pakistan enlist the security, protect and promote its interests

Terrorism: A Challenge of Pakistan's Foreign Policy and Way Forward

abroad with favourable and peaceful environment to thrive as a sovereign independent state. Theoretically, the dynamism demands that foreign policy should never be static and adjustable to the developments, but confined to the vital objectives of the national security against external threats. No country is free from the burden to face the challenges on its external and internal fronts. Challenges in internal front does not fall in the purview of this study, so focus is on the foreign policy challenges.

Since inception, Pakistan has to face a vast array of formidable challenges in external front. From the very first day India failed to reconcile with the idea of creation of a separate homeland for the Indian Muslims by dividing Bharat Mata (Sherwani, 1964). This Singh *pre-war* mind-set which is still prevailing with the new face of Narinder Modi, made security environment of South Asia very fragile prone to wars, poverty, scarcity of resources, underdevelopment and welcoming to the undue involvement of international forces. Rather at times it became the flashpoint international politics. South Asia due to India, Pakistan rivalry, distrust and animosity became wrestling ring for super powers' tug of war. The cold war, politics did not bring any good, especially in Pakistan. It failed to achieve its interests regarding Kashmir, the special clientele relationship with the USA during the entire period of the cold war could not help it to avoid the debacle of 1971, and break up of Pakistan (Burke & Ziring, 2000).

The ensuing years put Pakistan in quagmire of challenges and problems. When the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan took place in 1979, the trio of Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and the USA with relentless Afghan Mujahedeen resistance shattered the soviet empire into pieces and open doors of terrorism, terrorists and extremism mind-set. General Zia reign and Soviet invasion took place simultaneously bringing an opportunity for him to guise as defender of ideological frontiers by using religion as a source of legitimacy. This use of religion earmarked the destructive process of sectarianism along the Shia minority, and Sunni majority, which was further divided into Brailvi and Deobandi sects. This fragmentation and differences along the fault lines of these sects turned into hostile sectarian clashes. The Deobandi joined hands with the military dictatorship of Zia regime who empowered Deobandis by strengthening their murderers, and allocating huge sums of money for these murders. These madrasahs later unleashed all kinds of extremism endangering the Pakistan social fabric. The Madrasahs graduates turned out to be the members of religious, political parties and functionaries of various government funded institutions (Shah, 2014).

Many laws were introduced by the Zia regime that proved fatal for the safety and security of minority rights. The blasphemy law was the one which was deliberately misused to intimidate the minorities or to even the score for personal feuds. The current example is the death of a KPK university student Mashal Khan of the not proven until blasphemous issue. Besides internal events, external factors such as the Iranian revolution (1979) Iran- Iraq war, Iran, Saudi conflict added fuel to the sectarianism and extremism in Pakistan. Which unleashed forces who were really the perpetrators of terrorism.

Section II

Pakistan: as Victim of Active Terrorism and Facing Blame Game as the Perpetrator of Terrorism Across National Boundaries

Pakistan is the only country in the world that has gone through the brunt of the menace of terrorism in both ways. It is a victim of it with 70000 thousand human casualties and heavy economic losses. It is and has been blamed with labels of state sponsored terrorism and rogue state. It has to combat with Western self-created concept of blaming Muslim as terrorist; the most lethal campaign was faced by it, when armed forces and nuclear scientists were held responsible for nuclear proliferation and having connection with Taliban who were being supported by Al-Qaeda. The command and control and Pakistan's ability to protect its nuclear assets and prevention of transfer of nuclear technology to other states were questioned time and again with suspicions and distrust.

The two major factors besides others are accounted for as the source of labeling Pakistan a rogue and terrorist state. The never ending history of conflicts with India has made Pakistan to have a foreign policy with only security specific interests.

Kashmir, a bleeding wound of South Asia has endangered the security and stability of the region thrice in history, as in 1948, 1965, and 1971 with countless border clashes.

The freedom movement apparently in Kashmir has joined hands with radical Islamic groups, who term themselves as jihadi. Thus the role of Islamic radical groups, operating in Kashmir has become a critical element of the infrastructure of terrorism within the country. They are the unofficial or an undeclared segment of Pakistan's Kashmir policy, with an undocumented role in Kashmir Policy and Pakistan's response to Indian atrocities in Indian Held Kashmir. In 2003 President General Musharraf benignly assured to the United States that in future Pakistan would ensure preventive measures to stop cross border infiltration through LOC (line of control). This was taken by the international community as a proof of Pakistan using acts of terrorism and terrorist organizations to further their foreign policy agendas encapsulated to change the status quo regarding Kashmir issue (Hussain, 2016).

It has been blamed by the international community that these jihadi groups have become a tool in the hands of the Pakistani authorities to wage proxy war in Kashmir, giving India a message that any settlement of Kashmir issue or even a host of other issues would not be settled on Indian terms.

Since the withdrawal of Soviet forces, Afghanistan also became part of this spectrum. From then on, Pakistan devised a policy to ensure to install a friendly and pliable government in Afghanistan. The grand strategy of supporting Taliban was adopted. The vision to implant a friendly government in Afghanistan was based on many advantages. These advantages are summed up:-

Strategic Depth

Unfortunately Geography being ungracious disadvantaged Pakistan with the lack of strategic depth, particularly under nuclear environments. All major centres of population are bordered on either India or Afghanistan. With stable and friendly Afghanistan, Pakistan presumed to be able to rectify this geographic lacuna accumulating better strategic posture in the region for its security matters (Fatima, 2014).

Route to Central Asia

Soviet disintegration with Independence of Central Asian states, the vision of Pakistan implanting a friendly government in Afghanistan guided and also grounded in the desire that Pakistan and Afghanistan, by working together, could become an entrance point to the landlocked countries of Central Asia. Pakistan and Afghanistan could jointly by the dictates of geography end the decades old isolation. The vision was that a friendly Kabul would be better capable accompanying Pakistan to provide a land bridge between Central Asia and the rest of the world, specifically energy hungry Europe, America and South East Asia and Japan. Pakistan was one of the first countries to send a delegation to all the Central Asian countries in November-December 1991, led by the then Minister of state for economic affairs (Fatima, 2014). This vision is now one of the bases of CPEC.

To Lessen the Impact of Indian's Designs

Pakistan in order to bolster its security, virtually threatened due to the antagonistic attitude of Indian policy maker's right from Nehru to till to date, has to formulate a particular set of foreign policy tools and vision named as "India centric". In pursuance of this vision, Pakistan nourished Islamic proxies in Kashmir, and then same was applied to Afghanistan in 70s when PM Zulfikar Ali Bhutto devised a policy to support Islamists' Pushtoons, with a purpose to marginalize the impact of Pukhtoon nationalists in Pakistan who were being supported by the Afghan Pauktoon nationalists, the backbone of Pakhtoon insurgency of Pakstoonsitan movement. This policy continued and actually in full bloom implemented during the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan. Under the India- centric vision, these Islamists' proxies, refreshed with connections of international jihadi groups, was redirected towards Kashmir and India. India also with the vision to destabilize Pakistan, time and again reinvigorating its policy parameters, did not lose any chance to hit back in a befitting manner. In post 9/11 situation, India came up with its designs with the aims of: isolation of Pakistan at international level; augmenting the internal sectarian/ethnic chaos and economic deterioration. In addition, it wanted to marginalize Pakistan's nuclear capability by taking advantage of 9/11 precarious geostrategic situation.

Pakistan in full cognizance of India's designs, unveiled any opportunity available at its disposal to use proxies to give India a befitting response. Consequently the extremist organizations like Lashkar-e-Taiba and Hurkukul Mujahideen and other jihadi groups, being let loose, became the part of the international jihad network. They had bases in Afghanistan; their members were Afghan, Arabs Bangladeshis, and Indian Muslims who took part in Jihad during the 1990s. As in 1998 Mullah Omer said we support the jihad in Kashmir. During the Kargil conflict despite all denials, Pakistani troops operationally supported the Islamists fighters. So Pakistan is blamed to be in close connections and dual policy on the Issue of Afghanistan and Kashmir. This dual policy had great repercussions on regional and international levels besides domestic hazards.

Pakistan Joined War against Terrorism and the Way Forward

Pakistan's resolve against terrorism resulted in its decision to join US sponsored war on terrorism in meaning full way. In return, Washington fortified its military, economic and diplomatic relations with Pakistan. Pakistan took a U-turn on its Afghan policy, and lost whatever influence it had attained in Afghanistan throughout 1990s.

This U-turn could not be digested or reconciled by the religious parties and some other politicians, who considered it a smash and a betrayal of the Taliban whom Pakistan had been fostering for the last one decade. The war on terrorism has built up strong US pressures on Pakistan in terms of controlling and eliminating the various fundamentalist groups in its territory and across Afghanistan.

Pakistan's Counterterrorism Measures

In return of mounted pressure of the US and as a key ally against terrorism, throughout 2004 Pakistan undertook various cleanup operations against terrorists and their supporters on the border with Afghanistan as well as in the urban areas. Approximately, 500 Al-Qaeda operatives were initially bagged by Pakistan in these efforts. Since Pakistan involved in the worldwide war against terror, there have been many large scaled military operations in Pakistan's northern areas. All the military operations were planned and focused on local and foreign activists, especially Al-Qaeda, the TTP.

In early 2002, Pakistan Army started conducting operations against militants and their supporters in FATA and PATA. The list of military operations directed by military against the terrorists include support for Operation Enduring Freedom (2001–2002); Operation Zalzala and Operation Sher Dil (2008); Operations Rah-e-Haq to Operation Rah-e-Rast (2007–2009); Operation Rah-e-Nijat (2009–2010) Operation Zarb-e-Azab (15 June 2014); Operation Rad-ul-Fasad (2017- onward).

Section III

Terrorism as Foreign Policy Challenge

The terrorism issue had cast grave impact on Pakistan's relations with big powers and region's countries as well and proved to be the major concerns. Specifically the Washington believed that Pakistan was involved in terrorist activities. So with the height of suspicions and distrust Pakistan was charged with the allegations like; Arab militants and veterans of Afghan Jihad were allegedly used by Pakistan to train Kashmiri freedom fighters to fight in collaboration of Kashmiri mujahedeen.

Pakistan was also blamed to have been involved in the provision of sanctuary to terrorists like Ramzi Yousaf and Aimal Kansi, the masterminds of the blasts at World Trade Center at New York on 26 February, 1993 respectively in the killing of two CIA officials in the USA. The mantra of double game became the routine propaganda fodder against Pakistani Government. Afghan government constantly shared this accusation game for supporting anti Afghan elements who, according to successive Kabul governments were extensively involved in terrorist attacks in Afghanistan (Khalid, 2016).

Pakistan Government time and again rejected and condemned this blame game and protested that all what USA's charges was the reflection of the Indian mindset. Pakistan claimed it was neither involved in providing sanctuary to terrorist nor was promoting such activities. Pakistan was persistent in saying that they are only giving moral and diplomatic support to Kashmiri freedom fighters. To substantiate its claim Pakistan took concrete measures which included expelling over 600 Arabs, signing extradition treaties with Egypt in 1994, arrest and extradition of three Egyptian terrorists, and arrest and extradition of Ramzi Yousaf and Aimal Kansi to USA in February 1995 and June 1997 respectively. Historical evidences clearly evaluate that the foreign policy of Pakistan is largely driven by the military specifically army and intelligence. The chief reasons behind this dominance are the failure of several democratic governments, anti-Indian policy, and alliance with US, political instability and lack of competent political leadership in Pakistan.

The Consequent Isolation Paradox

Pakistan despite all international pressures is assumed that it's not doing enough against religious extremism and madrassas. Pakistan's commitment to counterterrorism has also been time and again challenged and practically showed the world, when U.S. Commandos killed al-Qaeda mastermind Osama bin Laden at a compound not far from Islamabad. This was the most important event or the starting point when Pakistan was to face the isolation paradox. Since then, an uneasy relationship exists between the US and Pakistan. Nowadays, the relations

Nabila Akhtar, Qamar Fatima & Syeda Phool Zahra

are more strained due to major area of the difference currently centre son how both countries view the issue of bringing stability to Afghanistan and protecting their vital national interests.

Iran: The Growing Animosity

There is a rivalry between Pakistan and Iran, too. At the time of Iranian president's visit, the issue of Kalbhushan spoiled the once upon a time good relations with Iran. India's relations with Iran are refining, which has become a main source of irritant between both Iran and Pakistan. Gwadar and Chabhar are embryonic competitor. Chabhar developed by India to carve out a new trade route to landlocked Afghanistan, where it has increased its economic and diplomatic presence. India is actually making efforts to circumvent Pakistan, its arch rival through the Chabahar port. From a Pakistani perspective, Iran's uncomfortable policy posture over the increasing presence of China in Baluchistan and India's hostility to CPEC converged interests with India and seemed involved in spying and cross border skirmishes on Pakistan Iran border. Pakistan has recently shot down an Iranian drone over Panjgur. Foreign office claimed it was a spy drone in pursuance of China –Pakistan economic corridor region surveillance.

China: from Geo –Politics to Geo Economics

From one account, it can said that the growing economic interaction with undermine and marginalized all fears of isolation in the international community. As Pakistan is going to be a bridge through Chinese one belt one road intuitive initiative to connect the sixty eight countries of three continents. Because of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), China and Pakistan are moving closer to one another. China has pledged \$46 billion in investment under CPEC. However, some challenges making this network of relationship strained, especially with respect to radical Islam and China's fears of radicalization amongst the Uyghurs in Xinjiang. India, as a competitor of China in both the global energy game and regional hegemony, is not comfortable with China's strategic goals of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor project. These appear to be energy security, the policing of the energy pipelines, oil trade, and strategic dominance of the Indian Ocean.

Afghanistan: The Unsafe Backyard of Pakistan

Even after the withdrawal of US Forces from Afghanistan, Pakistan is still facing terrorist attacks in its territory. Even though the peace talks were carried out by Pakistan. When Afghan President Ashraf Ghani took office, he showed considerate behaviour towards Pakistan. But due to later developments like the announcement of the demise of Mullah Mohammed Omar in Karachi, the subsequent rise in the terrorist attacks in Afghanistan, he changes his stance and

Terrorism: A Challenge of Pakistan's Foreign Policy and Way Forward

again, Pakistan was accused of managing safe sanctuary to the militants active against Afghan territory, a charge Pakistan has constantly denied. In the given circumstances the relations with Afghanistan are seemed improbable to improve, The U.S has also accused Pakistan beings providing sanctuaries to Haqqani Network and the Afghan Taliban, which have been carrying out attacks in Afghanistan. Pakistan and Afghanistan relations are interlocked into a vicious cycle. The blame and counter blame rhetoric is the common currency of both the countries diplomatic language. Military top brass recently reiterated the stance that the terrorist sanctuaries in Afghanistan are operating and being supported by the NDA and RAW. This has also been condemned that The US has not acknowledged Pakistan's sacrifices against terrorism, and demanded by Pakistani high echelons that the time has come to make other stakeholders especially Afghanistan to do more. There are very dim chances on the part of the both the countries to resolve their differences through peaceful means.

United States of America: An Unsatisfied Partner

The US-Pakistan relations have historically been termed as a marriage of convenience, and thus remained primarily transient in nature. The instability in Afghanistan and US Afghan-Pak approach stalled further improvement. The schism that exists regarding how to deal with the Afghan Taliban and the Haqqani network has aggravated the increasing tension between once most allied ally or non NATO partner. The reflection of this tension can be found out in the statements of congressmen, specifically two republican –Dana Rohrabacher and Ted Poe cast aspersions on Pakistan as a state sponsored terrorism which has links with terrorist organizations, which according to them are well founded. Both during the hearing at another subcommittee for terrorism, non-proliferation and trade demanded that the US should stop selling weapons to Pakistan and declare it state sponsor terrorism. The congressman further added that “Pakistan is playing with us. We give them money. That money ends up in the hands of bad guys in Afghanistan who hurt Americans. And I personally think that Pakistan should not get any money at all”.

Currently, China, Pakistan economic corridor has become a real threat to already estranged relations between the USA and Pakistan. Concurrently, Pakistan is leaning towards China for its increasing economic, defence and strategic needs. Trade has increased by 18.2 percent it reached 4.4 billion \$ by the year 2016.

The isolation paradox is day by day worsening as the US, Iran and India being alienated to Pakistan supporting Afghanistan position. India has almost clutched Pakistan into a state of sandwich position by extending its influence in Afghanistan. Indian Prime Minister Modi in his most recent two day visit to the USA has won the endorsement of US president for his objection over CPEC as it is termed a violation of Indian sovereignty. The CPEC would pass through the Pakistani Kashmir. In addition, the Trump Administration pledged to give a 2\$ billion sale of naval surveillance drones and a 366 \$million C-17 transport plane.

A refreshed partnership against under the title of “ Shoulder to Shoulder against terrorism “ vowed to fight the terrorist groups listed as Al-Queda, ISIS, Jaish-e Muhammad, Lahskar-e –Tayyiba, D-Company and the affiliates. Washington has wholeheartedly recognized India’s role in Afghanistan. This situation has become very precarious as Pakistan finds no other way but to depend on non-state actors. Pakistan is facing the worst kind of terrorism. The recent Parachinar bomb incident with death rising up to 150 innocent people and more than hundred injured is proof of a fragile law and order situation due to terrorist attacks.

Conclusion

The devastating and horrific day of 9/11, when the first time in history, the US mainland and symbols of powers were attacked, the issue of Terrorism crossed the national boundaries engulfing the continents. It is a global reality which is inflicting serious damages to many countries. And Pakistan is one of the worst-hit countries. Terrorism in Pakistan, unlike other countries, is a multidimensional, deep-rooted and widespread phenomenon in terms of its underlying causes, novelty and variety of techniques. That is why fighting the war against terrorism, with only an option of victory, has become the top agenda for the government of Pakistan. Terrorism in the present day world has become the most formidable foreign policy challenge for Pakistan.

At the time of Pakistan’s creation, the veterans of Pakistan movement and Quaid-e-Azam crafted the guiding principles of foreign policy. In an address to the people the first Governor General and father of Pakistan outlined these principles; the promotion of peace and prosperity, helping the oppressed nations, uphold the charter of UNO along with friendliness with Muslim countries and other countries of international community. The hallmark of these guiding principles given by Quaid-e-Azam was the assurance of good will on international dealings.

Pakistan from very first day learned to survive in a very fragile and vulnerable security environment, multiplied by the early perilous economic deficiencies. The initial dilemmas of distribution of resources and India’s unjustified and illegal seizure of Junagadh, Hyderabad and Kashmir led policy makers to use foreign policy as a tool to achieve its security cum economic objectives. This situation became more challenging when Afghanistan on western border also adopted a hostile attitude towards Pakistan based on its irredentism of NWFP and Balochistan’s parts of areas. From its independence till now, the pressing economic and security requirements left Pakistan with little option to adopt an independent foreign policy.

Throughout the history of Pakistan, due to fragility of security environment the military has remained on forefront in respect of policy making regarding security issues, whether it acted as in power elite or as out power elite. However, the preeminence of military elite has enhanced manifold after the epoch making decision to join the war on terrorism at the behest of the USA. Since then the security policy and foreign policy of Pakistan are intertwined in terms of

Terrorism: A Challenge of Pakistan's Foreign Policy and Way Forward

consequences. Pakistan had to withdraw its support from Taliban. The Taliban policy was the result of a long cherished desire of Pakistan to install a friendly pro Pakistan government to have a safe, stable backyard on its western side to counter India's pressure from the eastern border. To connect with the emerging Central Asia and marginalize the native Pushtoon nationalists were also the drivers of pro-Taliban policy of Pakistan (Fatima, 2014).

Pakistan extended all out support to Operation Enduring Freedom launched by the USA and the international community with full consensus. This support includes logistical, communication and emergency support by offering use of airports in Sind and Baluchistan. The US and Pakistan's military and intelligence established started a new phase of cooperation. Sanctions were withdrawn, enhanced trade, financial support for several sectors like health, education. Pakistan in full cognizance of the US Past practice of leaving the region unattended without resolving the core issue of Kashmir and unstable Afghanistan continued to work out for parallel policy options. These policy options were based on the use of jihadi outfits which were in close connection with the Pakistani establishment due to long resistance against the Soviet Union to get free Afghanistan. The Pakistani Policy makers were of the opinion that to curtail India's animosity and Kashmir Freedom could be the best attained by the use of non-state actors and jihadi outfits. This created a schism between Pakistan and the USA, resulted into the mantra of "Do More" on the part of Washington.

The US government wanted more concerted action by Pakistan against Foreign Terrorist organization (FTO) which were designated as by the US authorities. Washington has cast aspersions on Pakistan, based on allegations being supportive to Haqaqani network, LeT, ISIL, HUJI, JEM, Judhallah, LJ, TTP, and Al-Qaida. These FTO's are claimed being supported by Pakistan as its foreign policy tools. This scenario has put Pakistan into an isolation paradox. The once Non- NATO ally and most active partner of the USA in the war on terrorism is facing the unsatisfied attitude of the USA. From the regional perspective, Iran, Afghanistan and India are sailing in the same boat of animosity of Pakistan. Though, Pakistan has shown its full resilience against terrorism by launching successful military operations against terrorists. In diplomatic front Pakistan failed to present its case of determination to eradicate all kinds of terrorists from its territories. Conclusively, it can be said that terrorism has become a foreign policy challenge.

The way forward is that to break the complex terror structure operating in Pakistan the government, in consultation with all the political entities and the armed forces, has come up with the 21st Constitutional Amendment and formed a National Action Programme (NAP) to launch a sustained crackdown against the banned outfits. The NAP authorities have made the relevant security departments to reach out to the friendly countries to clamp down on the finances of terrorist networks in Pakistan. At the domestic level NAP mainly entails the formation of speedy trial courts, regularizing the madrassa system, checking the re-emergence of proscribed organizations, a ban on hate speeches and publishing of hate-

spreading material including misuse of the loudspeaker and reactivation of National Counter Terrorism Agency (NACTA).

The Way Forward

✓ **Pro- Active Diplomacy**

No doubt Pakistan needs a more coherent foreign policy in terms of the issue of terrorism, with well-defined targets, coordinated with the pressing demands of international and regional countries. But this revisit of Foreign policy needs to be done very cautiously. For this purpose diplomatic front needs to be revitalized. A specific diplomatic corps needs to be established specifically to make realize the world about the real threats emanating from the regional environment. The special focus should be on India's designs against Pakistan's existence and its non-reconciliation posture from the day first of partition of India. People from diverse segments of society like academia, sports, actors, youth, media personnel, NGO's, should be made a part of this diplomatic corps. To come out from the isolation paradox, Pakistan's foreign missions should be strengthened with financial and human resources to facilitate the above mentioned diplomatic corps with a proper check and balance system to achieve well defined targets and goals.

✓ **Regional trade and connectivity needs to be enhanced**

Fredric Bastiat has said “ when goods don't cross borders, soldiers will”¹ So the time has come to rethink for enhancing bilateral trade with India and Afghanistan, though it's easy to say but hard to crack the nut. By applying the concepts of peaceful co-existence and détente, these regional countries can abridge the trust gap.

✓ **Use Media Productively**

Media is inherently an opinion leader, and opinion making of masses service provider. This ability needs to be used positively by India, Afghanistan and Pakistan simultaneously. The language and cultural commonalties can outdo the

¹Frédéric Bastiat (A French classical liberal theorist, political economist, and member of the French assembly)

Claude-Frédéric Bastiat was a French economist and author who was a prominent member of the French Liberal School. **Born:** June 30, 1801, [Bayonne](#) **Died:** December 24, 1850, [Rome](#)
Nationality: French

political differences. However, to implement this recommendation a visionary media leadership and sensitized civil society should be needed.

✓ **Promote Unity in Diversity narrative**

Sectarian fault lines in Pakistan have actually become the sanctuaries of extremist outfits. This is the need of time to publicize a new narrative which promotes and strengthens the acceptance level for religious and sectarian diversity of Pakistani society. Educational institutions, both formal and informal can be better instruments in teaching the unity in diversity narrative.

✓ **Revisit Tactical And Strategic Priorities**

For long, Pakistan has been using the proxies as foreign policy tools. These proxies have been used in the region sometimes very effectively, but avoided the backlash of the use of militant extremist organizations. The regional countries, especially India and Afghanistan respond more bitterly, endangering the lives of innocent citizens of Pakistan who have nothing to do with these strategic and tactical policy parameters of Pakistan's foreign policy. So to achieve internal security, Pakistan needs to re-tune its strategic world view. Pakistan is trapped in a very complex situation. All the banned organizations, including global terrorists' movements involved in cross border terrorism in India and Afghanistan or even in the Middle East have become the feeding source in terms of ideology and recruitments to anti Pakistan elements. So a very conscious effort should be made to understand this phenomena on the part of the government, and marginalize the role of non –state actors in achieving the foreign policy objectives.

References

- Ahmer, M. (2009). *Foreign Policy Making Process: A Case Study of Pakistan*. Karachi: Department of International Relations, University of Karachi, Pakistan.
- Burke, S. M., & Ziring, L. (2000). *Burk Pakistan Foreign Policy: An Historical analysis* (Karachi : Oxford University Press, 2000. Karachi: Oxford university press.
- Cillarel, K. (n.d.). *Pakistan and World: Islamabad Institute of Pacific Relation*, Islamabad, 142.
- Fatima, Q. (2014). *Pakistan's Interests and Policy towards Taliban Regime in Afghanistan (1996-2001): An Analysis of Role of Military and Bureaucratic Elite*. *International affairs and global strategy*, 18(3), 1-15.
- Gibson, H. (1944). *The road to foreign policy*. New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Co. Inc.
- Hussain, Z. (2017, December 7). *Acrimony at the heart of Asia*. Dawn. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1300921>

Nabila Akhtar, Qamar Fatima & Syeda Phool Zahra

- Imtaiz, S. M. (1996). *International Relations Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow*. Lahore: Caravan enterprises.
- Johari, J. (1997). *International relations and politics-Theoretical Perspective*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private limited.
- Kegley, W. (2004). *World Politics-Trend and Transformation*. New York: Wadsworth.
- Khalid, I. (2016). *Revisiting Pakistan's National Security Dilemma*. Lahore: Peace publication.
- Khan, A. (Institute of Strategic Studies. 2015, June 2). *Peace, Progress in Afghanistan: Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad*. Retrieved August 2015, from <http://issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Issue-brief-dated-2-6-20151.pdf>
- Marghella, C. (2011). *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla (Np: New World Liberation Front)* p.32. New York: Praetorian press.
- Michael, S. (2007). *Terrorism a socio –Economic and Political Phenomenon with special to Pakistan*. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 35-36.
- Papp, D. (1994). *Contemporary International Relations, Framework for Understanding*. USA: Macmillan College Publishing Company.
- Ribicoff, A. (1979). *Domestic terrorism*. Washington, D.C.: Center for policy research.
- Rizvi, H. A. (1993). *Pakistan and the geostrategic Environment: A study of Foreign policy*. New York: St Martin Press.
- Shah, M. N. (2014). *Evolution of Sectarianism in Pakistan: A threat to the State and Society*. *A Research Journal of South Asian studies*, 29(2), 441-459.
- Sherwani, L. A. (1964). *Foreign Policy of Pakistan: An analysis*. Karachi: the Allied Book corporation.
- Tripathi, A. (2008). *Foreign Policy-Theory and Practice*. New Dehli: Murari Lal and Sons.
-