



Analyzing the U.S. Unilateralism and its Strategic Consequences for Pakistan: A Case Study of the George W. Bush Administration (2001 - 2009)

Kamal Mustafa¹, Khalida Hira², Moomal Manzoor³, Dr. Kiran Sami⁴

1. Research Scholar, kamalsammoo@gmail.com
2. PhD Scholar, khalida.hira.s@gmail.com
3. Research Scholar, Moomalsoomro26@gmail.com
4. Professor, University of Sindh

Abstract

International politics have undergone numerous changes since the turn of the twenty-first century. The security of people and their capacity to live in peace are threatened by terrorism. Even though it has been around since antiquity, it gained attention when the World Trade Centre was attacked on September 11, 2001. The events of September 11, 2001, changed domestic, regional, and international politics. Pakistan will face numerous immediate and long-term consequences if it joins the US-led coalition in the fight against terrorism. Pakistan was able to lift the sanctions, receive both military and economic support, and break free from international isolation thanks to the alliance. Additionally, it gained the position of a frontline state and non-NATO partner, demonstrating that it was the best ally among terrorists, rogue regimes, and failing states. Additionally, it was able to reinstate its Commonwealth membership, which had been suspended following the October 1999 military takeover. However, Pakistan is suffering greatly in socio-strategic areas. In the worldwide fight against terror, it sustained an incalculable loss. It had the most serious foreign policy dilemmas, had to modify its Afghan policy, and encountered challenges in its diplomacy while aiding the Kashmiri freedom movement. The nation's internal counterterrorism efforts brought up persistent socioeconomic issues that plagued society's efforts against militants and terrorists, increasing institutional instability.

Keywords: Unilateralism, Unilateral Policies of America, Political Instability, Social and Political Impacts, War Against Terror

Introduction

Pakistan is comparable to other South Asian nations in terms of significance due to its geographic position. Pakistan has a long border with several countries, including Afghanistan and India, both of which are strategically significant. A few decades ago, Pakistan enjoyed a close connection with Afghanistan, but since India gained its independence, relations have been tense. The world's circumstances, especially in South Asia, drastically changed after September 11, 2001. America attacked Afghanistan, and Pakistan became front line state in the war on terror. Consequently, America started taking unilateral action against Pakistan during the Bush administration. Due to its unilateralist policies, Pakistan has experienced political instability, lawlessness, terrorism, drone attacks, suicide assaults, socioeconomic problems, human casualties and the influx of millions of refugees. This paper examines the US unilateral initiatives that affected Pakistan during the George W. Bush administration. This paper aims to

analyze the policies of the Bush administration toward Pakistan and investigate the effects of unilateralism on Pakistan.

Unilateralism

In international relations, unilateralism is a tactic where states act without taking into account the support or interests of other nations. (Michelle Penn, 2021) Conversely, unilateralism is the tendency to steer clear of multilateral endeavors or to take independent action in addressing a particular global or regional issue instead of choosing to work together (Khong, Y., & Malone, David. 2003). Unilateralism can refer to the overall inclination of some powerful governments or groupings of states to act without respect for the equal sovereignty of their partners, as well as the use of legal unilateral acts. Such behavior has been more prevalent in the recent past. It brings up the question of the threat to the entire post-World War II international system, which is embodied in the UN Charter, which has cooperation as one of its fundamental tenets. In light of the new wave of unilateralism and the issues mentioned. Therefore, it is essential to first determine the degree of the overall requirement for cooperation and, second, the residual place of unilateral activity. (P-M Dupuy, 2000). The phrase "unilateralism" describes a situation in which a strong state conducts a self-serving foreign policy while ignoring multilateral principles (Wedgwood, 2002).

Research Questions

1. What major unilateral actions were conducted by the George W. Bush administration against Pakistan from 2001 to 2009?
2. How did the George W. Bush administration (2001–2009) affect Pakistan socially and politically?
3. During the George W. Bush era (2001–2009), what were the primary causes of the democratic process's instability?
4. What kind of ties were established with neighbouring nations like Afghanistan, Iran, and India under the George W. Bush presidency (2001–2009)

Significance of Study

No nation can escape getting involved in international politics in the modern world. This engagement needs to be thorough and grounded in well-defined ideas. Studying the American doctrine's unilateral activities from 2001 to 2009 is crucial since Pakistan is trying to protect both its territory and its people.

Additionally, the topic was chosen since unilateralism is a major global issue, especially in Pakistan. The nation's territorial integrity and the interests of its residents should be protected both inside and outside the nation.

Literature Review

The book "Bush at War" chronicles President George W. Bush's first 100 days in office after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. Numerous newly verified facts regarding America's unilateral actions are included in this book. Armitage and Collin Powell thought that Osama bin Laden was a big threat to the United States of America." Bob Woodward said. He went on to say that Bush himself takes the stage to participate in this horrific performance to minimize the aggressive war and present it as a defensive and retaliatory struggle. He affirms it again. "I knew there was a plan in place, but I'm not sure how developed it was. In any event, he made an effort to minimize the gravity of the issue by declaring that "Usama was not concerned for national security." (Bob Wood, 2002). An American political pundit, Charles Krauthammer (2002),

describes the characteristics of American unilateral behavior in his essays. According to his article, US Secretary of State Donald Rumsfeld declared in 2002 that "the mission must need the alliance, and the alliance must not dictate the mission." If that occurs, the mission's purpose would be diminished; we cannot afford such a thing. In his article, international relations professor Hamid Iqbal Yousafzai (2012) analyzed the security conditions following 9/11 and the ramifications of the war on terror. "The international community started to see terrorism as a collective threat to global security following the terrorist events of September 11, 2001," he said. The disaster not only changed the security of the world, the balance of power, but also the foreign policy of the United States of America. In the US and around the world, these terrorist attacks marked the beginning of a new era. In his work, political science professor David Hastings (2006) argues that policy errors in Iraq have little influence on U.S. foreign policy in the second term. He explains this way of thinking and then applies it. "After the attacks of 9/11, the foreign policy of the administration of George Bush radically transformed in its pursuit of the war on terror," he said, arguing that this failure made it unworthy of the title. As part of this shift, the administration created the United States' National Security Strategy in 2002, which came to be known as the Bush doctrine. This statement promoted the use of preemption and unilateralism in the quest for dominance. This article explores the evolution of this idea and how it was applied in Pakistan, arguing that policy failures lead to other policy failures. In his book "U.S.-Pakistan Relations," A.Z. Hilali (2005) explored the effects of Bush's doctrine. "There are numerous Islamic non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Pakistan," he stated. There are connections between violent Islamic groups and numerous Islamic non-governmental organizations. Some reports claim that Islamic NGOs have ties to radical organizations. "The growing activities in favour of Jihad need to be put down, and religious and extremist groups, including military groups, were invited by Musharraf."

Research Methodology

The unilateral stance of the US administration toward Pakistan is examined in this qualitative study. Qualitative research is crucial because it allows a researcher to fully understand the phenomenon or respondent. (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). In qualitative research, the investigator develops patterns and interpretations of different explanations. Jones and D'Cruz (2004). From data collection to data analysis, this study was led by the research questions. A variety of keyword/key term combinations, including "unilateral behavior, Bush policies, Bush doctrine and its political perspective for Pakistan were used to search for information on America's unilateral policies toward Pakistan. Furthermore, the bilateral and unilateral ties between Pakistan and the United States following the war on terror (2001–2009), the sociopolitical effects on Pakistan following the war on terror (2001–2009), and the interactions between Pakistan and its neighbors, including India, Iran, and Afghanistan, during the George W. Bush administration (2001–2009).

Results and Discussions

US Policies for Pakistan by Different Presidents

Khan Liaquat Ali In 1950, Pakistan's first prime minister left for the United States. He desired to meet Harry S. Truman, the president. For the CIA to create a base in Pakistan so they could monitor Soviet activity, he made the prime minister of Pakistan travel to the US first. The plea was turned down by Liaquat Ali Khan. During this period, Ayub Khan, foreign secretary, foreign minister, defense secretary, finance minister, and special representative Mir Laiq Ali were among the notable Pakistani leaders who travelled to the United States. In May 1954, the United

States and Pakistan signed a Mutual Defense Assistance pact. As part of the deal, the US formed a Military Assistance Advisory Group (Maag) in Rawalpindi and trained a large number of Pakistani soldiers. In 1956, President Eisenhower ordered the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr Suhrawardy, to lease Peshawar Airport to the US Army because they wanted to keep an eye on the ballistic missile program of Soviet Union. The Pakistani prime minister accepted the request. In the western portion of Pakistan, pro-American feelings were strong in the 1960s. On the other hand, financial and military assistance were mostly focused on West Pakistan. East Pakistan's circumstances were shifting. In East Pakistan, mistrust is causing serious concern. When Pakistani President Ayub Khan travelled to the US with his daughter, he consented to allow the US to send a spy operation to the Soviet Union from Pakistani territory. The United States expanded its aid to Pakistan, but it was lost during the Indo-Pakistan War in 1965. Pakistan's economy collapsed as a result of military and economic embargoes imposed by the United States due to the conflict. Despite the arms embargo, Pakistan was an important ally of the United States during the Cold War. Furthermore, Pakistan backed President Richard Nixon during his initial visit to the People's Republic of China. The United States considered giving Pakistan military support and weapons. Because losing Pakistan would mean losing a vital ally in the conflict with the Soviet Union, they sought to deter India from advancing farther into Pakistani cities during the 1971 war. Furthermore, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was a close friend and confidante of President Nixon despite being a socialist, which was advantageous for Pakistan. 1976–1979: Jimmy Carter, an anti-socialist president, wins the US presidency and pledges to work toward a ban on nuclear weapons.

When Nixon was president of the United States, Benazir Bhutto lost favor because Carter disapproved of his actions and strengthened the embargoes already imposed on Pakistan. In contrast, Bhutto was able to get supplies that would aid in the development of his atomic weapon program. Bhutto is said to have been threatened by President Carter and his government with interference with nuclear research and proliferation, which he disagreed with, creating a rift between the two nations. In 1979, Zia-ul-Haq came to power in Pakistan, and the United States and Pakistan had a cordial relationship based primarily on military cooperation and achievements. At that time, the United States invested billions of dollars and collaborated with the CIA and ISI to keep Soviet soldiers out of the area. The United States provided financial and military assistance totaling billions of dollars for this goal. By 1981, Pakistan had reached an agreement with the United States regarding \$3.2 billion in funding. In 1987, Pakistan surpassed Israel as the biggest recipient of aid. Despite the Pressler amendment being passed by Congress, General Zia passed away. The amendment made it unlawful to provide Pakistan with significant economic and military assistance unless the nation could demonstrate that its citizens are not utilizing funds for nuclear proliferation. Despite Pakistan's revelations in 1984 and 1987, it is alleged that sanctions were not implemented until 1990. Due to the Pressler Amendment, the United States imposed sanctions on Pakistan in 1990. The United States and Pakistan's relationship deteriorated in 1992. Additionally, US Ambassador Nicholas Platt cautioned Pakistan that it would cause instability in India if it continued to support militants. It would be included in the list of states that support terrorism. Benazir Bhutto visited the US. Persuaded US President Bill Clinton to waive Pakistan's embargoes in 1995 and launched a coordinated effort to counter extremism in the area. Bhutto's request led to the ratification of the Brown amendment, which gave Pakistan access to \$368 million in military hardware that had been ordered but not delivered when the Pressler amendment restrictions were put in place in 1990. But the restriction on weapons persisted. When Nawaz Sharif became prime minister of Pakistan in 1998, he carried out a nuclear test in Balochistan as payback for India's similar tests, which

infuriated Clinton's administration. President Clinton imposed sanctions on Pakistan and India in accordance with the Glenn Amendment (Ali 2011, 76).

However, in 1998, the US relaxed sanctions against Pakistan and India, allowing them to buy agricultural products from American farms. Following the 9/11 attacks in 2001, Pakistan emerged as one of the United States' most significant strategic allies. In 2003, a \$1 billion loan was forgiven by the United States as a gesture of goodwill for its support. President George W. Bush named Pakistan a non-NATO ally in 2004. It made it possible to buy cutting-edge military and strategic gear. Since 2004, the US Army has carried out several drone strikes in the northern part of the nation. Although the drone attacks were directed at Pakistani Taliban members and supporters of al Qaeda, they also killed a number of civilians and caused a great deal of indignation in Pakistan. To strengthen its defense against India, Pakistan allegedly misused US aid funds meant for cooperation in the fight against terror, according to a 2007 research. Since the start of the war on terror in 2008, there has been a lack of confidence between the two sides. The US has accused the Pakistan Army of providing information to the Taliban and pro-Taliban during US operations. The US Army killed eight Taliban and eleven Pakistan Army Frontier Corps paramilitary soldiers in an airstrike in June 2008. The strike and killings infuriated Pakistan's leadership, which claimed that the crime had undermined the foundation of cooperation and confidence (Dawn.com, July 4, 2012, Timeline: History of US-Pakistan relations).

Impacts of War against Terror

Political Unrest

A lack of elected government, power game between the government and the court, and entrusted provincial- federal relations contribute to inefficient rule of government. Inflation, unemployment, and reluctance among investors to undertake investments are the results of this. In order to run the federal government and the provinces, this results in political squabbling. Such political squabbling results in power sharing and is detrimental to the economy of developing nations like Pakistan. (Murphy et al. 2009,7). Pakistan has neglected its own people's needs. Poor administration, total dependency on the military, which led to political unrest and increased extremism. The extremist parties like Al Qaeda and its co-parties continued to operate in the territory of Pakistan (Hathway 2010). Pakistan's military, security forces, government officials, and citizens were the targets of more than a dozen strikes. On September 3, 2008, Pakistan experienced its first direct military assault by forces other than India in its 60-year history. (Malik 2010). Pakistan's security and sovereignty were at risk. Tribal people are impacted by fundamental needs, unfavorable social and economic circumstances, and insufficient institutions. With 60% of the population living in poverty, FATA is Pakistan's most impoverished area. The region's growing militancy was mostly influenced by poverty and hardship. (Ali 2011,76). For a long time, FATA has been recognized as both a genuine portion of Pakistan's territory and its strategic depth. In actuality, Pakistan's foreign policy has always been based on safeguarding its boundaries and refusing to compromise on its national objectives. (Hilali 2010, 67). Many new problems have been created for Pakistan's government by the Taliban, which became a direct threat to Pakistan, weakening the leadership of Pakistan. The defense industry has increased its budget as a result of this incident, which may be applied to any development initiatives. The government's many agencies were directly threatened by this, which led to a reduction in their operational effectiveness. In addition, posing a direct challenge to Pakistan's already unstable, weak, and anemic leadership. The military sector has also raised its

budget as a result of this occurrence, which may be used for any upcoming development projects. The numerous government agencies were directly threatened by this, which decreased their operational efficacy. It is anticipated that the more than 4 million Afghan immigrants to Pakistan will declare themselves to be a powerful political force while preserving their ethnic and cultural identities. The burdens that the nation's resources and services suffer as a result of the millions of refugees further raise this possibility. Afghan refugees are well-known not just for their large numbers but also for how long they remain in Pakistan. They are more likely to have an impact on local politics the longer they stay (Ahmed Khuram, 2011). Following 9/11/2001, the war on terror, sovereignty and security of Pakistan were jeopardized by its support of America. Al-Qaeda and the Taliban turned against Pakistan, helping radical religious organisations to destabilize the country. Pakistan is still paying for Musharraf's policies: The country's economy is unstable because of the suicide bomber culture; there is inadequate law and order; Pakistani citizens are being killed by foreign agents on Pakistani soil; corruption is legalized by the governmental elite class; and the Baloch people are asking for independence, not autonomy. When the Supreme Court declared the presidential reference and forced leave of the Chief Justice illegal and unconstitutional, this decision led to the Chief Justice's reinstatement.

Human Cost of Terrorism For Pakistan

The War on Terror has cost Pakistan a great deal of human life over the past twelve years. According to security services, Pakistan has lost 49,000 people since 2001, according to a March 27, 2013, report from the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan. Apart from civilians, the Police, Army, the Levies, Rangers, Frontier Corps have been the most afflicted groups in terms of disabilities, injuries and losses resulting from acts of terrorism. The number of persons killed in sectarian violence, terrorist actions, political violence, ethnic violence and target killings can be added to determine the human cost of terrorism. This is due to the growing interconnectedness of today's terrorist, sectarian, and ethno-nationalist groups. Tribal regions amid military campaigns against terrorists affiliated with the Taliban. Numerous security-related organizations in Pakistan, as well as numerous domestic and foreign research institutions, have confirmed these losses; the problem lies in the discrepancy in estimations regarding the number of casualties. Over 24,000 people, including civilians, law enforcement authorities, and military personnel, were killed in terrorist attacks between 2002 and 2013. The years 2007–2013 were more costly in terms of people. According to a research submitted to the Supreme Court by law enforcement agencies, over 25,000 people have died in Pakistan since 2008, with 15,681 military casualties occurring in tribal areas. Over 52,671 people have died as a result of terrorist activity in approximately 18,634 attacks, and an estimated 57,344 people have been injured, according to different accounts and statistics. The Interior Ministry's numbers vary since they probably don't account for the number of law enforcement, military, and insurgent deaths. Because of their proximity to Afghanistan, these three regions have been most severely affected by the war's aftereffects. These places are a haven for terrorism because of inadequate development and administration. Most military strikes, suicide attacks and drone attacks have occurred in these locations, resulting in higher fatalities. The estimated death toll by province from 2007 to 2012 is displayed in the table above.

Internally Displaced Persons (IDP's)

Counterterrorism and counterinsurgency military operations have resulted in the migration of people in KPK and FATA. Over five million people have been internally displaced since 2004 due to conflict in Pakistan's northwest, according to a June 2013 report published by the International Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC). The North West region has about 1.1 million internally displaced people (IDPs) due to war, and millions more are not registered. The

United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that there are approximately 1.1 million registered internally displaced people (IDPs) in the area, with many more being unregistered. According to a June 2013 estimate from the International Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC), warfare in Pakistan's northwest has caused approximately 5 million people to be internally displaced since 2004. In the North West, around 1.1 million IDPs have been officially recognized as displaced due to war; millions more are not. 17 The agencies most affected by FATA are Khyber and Kurram. In 2012, some 415,000 people were forcibly relocated, and since March 2013, at least 131,000 more people have left their homes. The majority of IDPs became a financial burden on the relevant government, and the psychological suffering and financial losses of leaving their homes and seeing the deaths of family members will have a lasting effect on society. Due to their displacement, there is a tremendous amount of hatred and disgust among the Pakistani state and military, which encourages more terrorism and makes them ideal targets for terrorist groups. In addition to displaced IDPs due to violence, Pakistan has the longest and longest-running refugee caseload in the world. There are over 1 million unregistered IDPs, over 1.6 million registered Afghan refugees, an additional one million unregistered, and nearly 15 million flood-related IDPs. The cost of rebuilding FATA would be unaffordable, especially as Pakistan has yet to rehabilitate and repatriate the IDPs from the 2005 earthquake, even though the Pakistani government has indicated willingness to help with the repatriation and rehabilitation of these IDPs.

Social Impacts

The country's economic growth and prosperity are being negatively impacted by Talibanization. Persistent terrorist activity is hindering investment and employment expansion, increasing the likelihood of another economic disaster in Pakistan. (Hina, S. 2009). Pakistan's economy is at risk due to the escalating conflict with the Taliban, which might turn a long-standing problem into a financial and economic catastrophe (Román, D. 2005).

Conclusion

Many aspects of the post-9/11 "war on terror" are similar to those of the Cold War, such as the US's considerable aid to Pakistan as a result of its cooperation with General Musharraf's military-led government, despite the nation's serious human rights violations and military rule. To achieve its own geopolitical goals, the US has never hesitated to back military rulers in Pakistan, according to this research. The examination of US military and economic support for Pakistan under different regimes suggests that the US has rarely shown concern for Pakistani democracy when its own geostrategic goals have been at risk. (Ali, M.2009). The discussion above illustrates how Pakistan, our dear nation, has endured tremendous hardship as a result of the war on terror and continues to pay a heavy price in the form of political instability, sluggish economic growth, destruction of infrastructure, and civilian casualties. Pakistan's soft image has also been harmed by the war on terror. (Khan, T. 2013). FATA until the start of the armed conflict in happened in Waziristan in 2004 Chari, (2011) Before September 11, 2001, there had never been a suicide attack in FATA, KPK, or anywhere else in Pakistan. Pakistan first opposed joining the international "war on terrorism," but it has recently become an active participant. Suicide terrorism did not start in KPK. (Trivedi, 2009). Pakistan's commitment to fighting terrorism both domestically and internationally came at a high cost. As a fighter and a target for the terrorists, Pakistan joined the front lines of the war against terrorism Gunaratna and Iqbal, 2011). Pakistan's concerns over the "war on terror" must be taken seriously by the United States and the rest of the globe. Because Pakistan is an ally of the United States in the war against terrorism, it has suffered the most. In the process, Pakistan has fallen victim to terrorism. Its

internal and international security are being severely harmed by the terrorism it is currently dealing with in all of its manifestations. Pakistan is already dealing with several problems, such as a faltering economy, inflation, unemployment, corruption, extremism, bad governance, sectarianism, and the constant danger of terrorism, which has caused dread and panic throughout the entire nation. The consequences of the "war on terror" are dire. Given Pakistan's current vulnerable situation, the US and other nations should show some compassion; Pakistan is clearly paying a heavy price for its decision to join the US's "war on terror." Concerns about Pakistan are significant and must to be taken seriously since everyone will benefit from a strong and stable Pakistan. Pakistan is a key player in this process and needs help in resolving its problems. It goes without saying that the region and the entire globe will benefit from a democratic and stable Pakistan. Pakistan can surely contribute significantly to a world free of conflict, so its efforts must be appropriately acknowledged. Time and persistence are necessary for successful counter-insurgency operations, especially when the insurgents are well-armed, well-funded, and battle-hardened, have the backing of a friendly community, and are skilled at negotiating the terrain. Pakistan's tribal areas, which are most severely affected by extremism and terrorism, may require five to ten years to achieve peace through administrative reforms, economic expansion, and militant activity Gunaratna and Iqbal, (2011).

Religious intolerance has become more prevalent in Pakistani society as a result of the war on terror; people have taken matters into their own hands; weaponization is widespread, and people have turned against law enforcement and anti-state organizations, including the military, for imposing this oppression on the populace. The war against terrorism may have some positive side effects, even though the majority of its effects on Pakistan are detrimental. These include the basic comprehension of greater self-sufficiency, FATA reform and integration, bolstering democratic institutions, demilitarization of society, reconsidering foreign policy, regional cooperation through trade and energy pipelines, normalization with India, increased cooperation with Iran, and managing relations with the US. Given the interdependence of politics and the battle against terrorism, it makes sense that nations could learn from volatile political and economic periods. Many initiatives have failed to win the public's support because of a lack of public participation. Such initiatives are viewed by the tribal males as an infringement on their business and an attempt to modernize their society at odds with their objectives (Marwat, 2007). Although Pakistan and Afghanistan have had significant cultural, historical, linguistic, religious, and traditional ties for thousands of years, their diplomatic relations are complex. They have long had tense relations because of the border issue, the flood of Afghan refugees into Pakistan, and the Taliban insurgencies in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. Despite their close diplomatic ties, the citizens of the two nations are nevertheless quite close. Pakistan thinks it will profit from a strong Afghanistan with stable conditions and brotherly ties. For this reason, she wants to play a big part in the growth and recovery of Afghanistan.

References

- Ahmad, K. M. (2011). *Talibanization in Afghanistan: Impact on Pakistan*.
- Ali, T. (2009). *The duel: Pakistan on the flight path of American power*. Simon and Schuster.
- CORBIN, J., & STRAUSS, A. (2008). *Basics Of Qualitative Research: Techniques And Procedures For Developing Grounded Theory* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage
- D'Cruz & Martyn Jones (2004). *Social Work Research—Ethical and Political Contexts*. London: Sage, ISBN 0-7619-4971-2, £ 17.99

- Dupuy, P. M. (2000). *The place and role of unilateralism in contemporary international law*. European journal of international law, 11(1), 19-29.
- Gunaratna R, Iqbal K (2011). *Pakistan: Terrorism Ground Zero*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd, p. 17.
- Hastings Dunn, D. (2006). *A Doctrine Worthy of the Name?: George W. Bush and the war*
- Hilali, A. Z. (2017). *US-Pakistan relationship: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan*. Taylor & Francis.
- Hilali, A. Z. (2017). *US-Pakistan relationship: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan*. Taylor & Francis.
- Hina,S, (2009), *Swat crises and Pakistan economy*". Retrieved from: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/5e890fc342410a39c4df16dc6fb19f21/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=32013>
- Marwat, F.(2007). *The Genesis of Change and Modernization in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) of Pakistan*. IPRI Journal, 7(2), pp. 73-87.
- Murphy, E., & Malik, A. R. (2009). *Pakistan Jihad: The making of religious Terrorism*. IPRI Journal, 1(2), 17-19.
- Malik, I. H. (2010). *Pakistan: democracy, terror and the building of a nation*. New Holland.
- Krauthammer, C. (2002). *The unipolar moment revisited. The national interest*, (70), 5-18.
- Khong, Y. & Malone, David. (2003). *Unilateralism and U.S. Foreign Policy: International Perspectives*. *Foreign Affairs*. 82. 10.2307/20033588
- Khan , T. (2013), *Pakistan's Contribution to global war on terror after 9/11*, ISSRA Papers
- Khan, H. (2013). *Pakistan's Contribution to global war on terror after 9/11*. IPRI Journal, 13(1), 37-56.
- Pen. M , *Study com* .2011, retrieved from: <https://study.com/academy/lesson/unilateralism-definition-international-relations.html>
- Román, D. (2005). 6. *Tragedy and the Performing Arts in the Wake of September 11, 2001. In Performance in America* (pp. 226-280). Duke University Press.
- Trivedi RN (2009). *Radicalization and Escalation of Modern Terrorism*. New Delhi: MD Publication Pvt Ltd, p. 238.
- Wedgwood, Ruth. (2001). *Unilateral Action in the UN System*. European Journal of International Law. 11. 10.1093/ejil/11.2.349.
- Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at war*. Simon and Schuster.
- Yusafzai, H. I. (2011). *The US Factor in Pak-Afghan Relation post 9/11.A*