



President Barrack Obama Strategic Policy towards Pakistan: An Overview

Dr. Imran Khan¹ & Dr. Nazim Rahim²

¹Ph.D in International Relations, Department of IR, Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Email: Imranzada1987@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor IIUI, Email: mnazimrahim@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:

February

06, 2026

Revised:

February

26, 2026

Accepted:

March

24, 2026

Available Online:

March

30, 2026

Keywords:

USA, Pakistan, Obama, Foreign Policy

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Imran Khan

Email:

Imranzada1987@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The Obama administration after taking the office as the President of the United States of America in 2009, his presidency was prepared and determined to defeat the terrorist and terrorist organizations. He was focused in dismantling Al-Qaeda from Afghanistan, Pakistan and rest of the world. Therefore, his administration has faced many challenges and issues from Pakistan side. His administration knew that the actual fight in combating terrorism and extremism was in Pakistan. During his reign as president of the United States of America, Pakistan became the main focus of his foreign policy in fighting the war against terrorism. Therefore, for this purpose the Obama administration devised strategic policy known as Af-Pak strategy to have check and balance on the both countries. The administration of the Barrack Obama wanted to destroy and dismantle the terrorist camps, shelters and financing to the terrorist organization from Pakistan's side. The fears were evident that the Taliban and Al-Qaeda could re-emerge if the screws were loosening on them. In order to achieve such goals and objective for his foreign policy the Obama administration used military, diplomatic and economic tools to control Pakistan in defeating the terrorist organizations. The Administration of Barrack Obama has made it clear to the international community and Pakistan that if Pakistan was unable to provide the desired support to his administration then he would act unilaterally and later on he did act unilaterally by challenging the sovereignty of Pakistan on several occasions. Furthermore, the relations of Pakistan and the United States of America under the first term of Obama presidency were not friendly the relations of the both countries were hostile after some incidents occurred during 2011. The government of Pakistan was constantly protesting to the government of the United States of America in the issues of its sovereignty. On the other side the administration of Barrack Obama was questioning Pakistan whether it was true ally of the US in the global war against terrorism. During the presidency of Obama he has launched deadly drone strikes in Pakistan in the ex-tribal belts of Pakistan, Operation Neptune Spear was conducted during his presidency, and Raymond Davis case took place during his administration. The Obama administration has seen many ups and downs in the relations of both Pakistan and United States of America. The theory of "Realism" has been applied to the research work which sees blatant realities and realistic approach to analyse the foreign policy of a country. Qualitative approach has been applied to dig out the striking aspects during the resaech work, books, journals and speeches has been studied to make the research work more formidable.

OPEN



ACCESS



Introduction

President Barrack Obama after taking the oath as president of USA supported the policy of mutual respect and cooperation with all countries of the world. The adherence of his policy for mutual cooperation included Pakistan as well. The importance of Pakistan in Obama administration was purely because of the American war focused policies in Afghanistan it was the main ally who was playing vital role in dismantling Al-Qaeda and Taliban in the region. The Obama administration considered Pakistan as one of the most important country to provide them with all kind of support in safeguarding their interests in the region. President Barrack Obama understood the actions taken by the Bush administration were not enough to utilize the potentials of Pakistan at the maximum level. The US administration under the leadership of President Barrack Obama prepared a strategic policy which was mainly concerned with security and Pakistan was given the main role to implement that policy in the region (Mohan, 2009). Therefore, President Barrack Obama in his speech told regarding his foreign policy about Pakistan: “But while we've achieved hard-earned milestones in Iraq, the situation in Afghanistan has deteriorated. After escaping across the border into Pakistan in 2001 and 2002, al Qaeda’s leadership established a safe haven there. Although a legitimate government was elected by the Afghan people, it's been hampered by corruption, the drug trade, an under-developed economy, and insufficient security forces” (Obama, 2009). The prime objective of the Obama administration policy was to make Pakistan self-sufficient and stable so it can have strong hold on its own territory, protect its nuclear weapons and fight the war against terrorism as it has been doing for almost a decade. President Obama during his presidency also wanted both Pakistan and India to resolve its outstanding and long lasting issues to promote socio-economic development in the region. If we analyze in a broader sense the Obama administration supported democracy and secularist form of government in Pakistan who had pro US stance in their foreign policy outlook. Some of the points are:

- a) The US key concern in Pakistan was to save the country from becoming the center of extremist Organizations.
- b) The US desired to make safe the nuclear weapons of Pakistan from the hands of extremists
- c) The US wanted to counter al-Qaida and other terrorist organizations operating in Pakistan.
- d) The US wanted to support Pakistan in order to bring steadiness, prosperity, and harmony in Afghanistan (Goswami, 2009).

The concerns shown by the Obama administration to destroy the terrorist organizations in both Pakistan and Afghanistan was quite important for his foreign policies. He did not only want the assistance of Pakistan but he wanted to destroy the sanctuaries of terrorism from Pakistan as well therefore he stated in his speech: “After consultations with our allies, I then announced a strategy recognizing the fundamental connection between our war effort in Afghanistan and the extremist safe havens in Pakistan. I set a goal that was narrowly defined as disrupting, dismantling, and defeating al Qaeda and its extremist allies, and pledged to better coordinate our military and civilian efforts” (Obama, 2009). Moreover, on September 24, 2009 the first meeting of friends of democratic Pakistan was held which was recognized during September 2008. This important meeting was held under the administration of President Barrack Obama, he himself along with the Prime Minister Gordon Brown the British Prime Minister, the President of Pakistan Asif Ali Zardari and other vital legislators from all parts of the world attended the meeting under the chairmanship of President Barack Obama. The honorable members of the meeting appreciated and congratulated President Asif Ali Zardari for stabilizing Pakistan and putting it on right track. They also appreciated the efforts of Zardari government in promoting democratic values in Pakistan which was vital for the stability of Pakistan. President Bush recognized the sacrifices made by the people of Pakistan during the war against terrorism. He along with other members of the meeting promised President Asif Ali Zardari

that they will keep on supporting Pakistan due to its sacrifices to achieve its goals in bringing peace and stability in the country (Friends of Democratic Pakistan ,2009)

During the meeting of Friends of Democratic Pakistan, President Barrack Obama emphasized the United Nations and other monetary related institutions to support and work on the development of Pakistan. He demanded technical financial interventions which will automatically boost the economy and infrastructure of Pakistan after the decade long destruction of war against terrorism. He advocated the policy of “trade not aid” as it is the only way to make states stronger and sovereign who can make their decisions at their will. Through this policy Pakistan can develop strong trade related ties with the richest and economically strong nations of the world. This trade policy will overcome the interdependency of Pakistan on Aid and automatically help on to change the approach and life styles of the masses living in Pakistan. During the meeting the point of tariffs was also discussed that the wealthy countries should decrease their tariffs for the export of goods which will benefit the small countries of the world (Bakr, 2009). Similarly, economy which is considered as the main point of concern for Pakistan since its inception, the administration of President Obama was of the point of view that Pakistan should be actively participating in the international market to gain benefits from global trade. The long term trade policy will automatically increase the national savings of Pakistan which will in return produce more viable opportunities for the creation of wealth (Mitchell, 2011). However, it is very important to mention that the “trade aid” policy by the Obama administration was not the immediate solution for the prolonged problems of Pakistan. The foreign aid would play imperative role in modernizing technology, engineering sector modernism and to bring technical and advanced reforms in the education sector. Then Pakistan can compete in the modern trended world economy. During the presidency of Barrack Obama administration, the non-security funds for Pakistan was increased and allotted to them. His administration was keen in making Pakistan far much developed and peaceful country of the world. He gave numerous of assistance to boost the education, health, infrastructure and energy sector of Pakistan (Mehrish, 2012).

Furthermore, Pakistan played vital role in fighting the US sponsored war against terrorism and it has achieved significant role in the policy of US in both Bush and Obama administrations. The instability inside the territory cannot be considered as domestic issues because of the presence of external elements in Afghanistan’s territory. The other factors like the US presence in Afghanistan made instability in this region. Pakistan has to cope with many elements to bring this region on the track of stability and prosperity. The border of Afghanistan with Pakistan was the main concern for Pakistan closely linked with the policies of Obama administration. Therefore, there were few positive steps taken by the Obama administration to make the ties of Pakistan and US stronger. These relations cannot be judged from the failure of President Barrack Obama not opting to visit Pakistan during his tenure. Some experts of the International Relations were of the view that these relations would prosper if President Obama does not change its policy from “security cooperation” to “economic cooperation”. It will automatically have prolonged and deep effects on the relations of the both countries (Dorani, 2019). The USA administration was clear of the fact that they would provide Pakistan with economic assistance rather military assistance which approved and allotted to Pakistan on many occasions during the bush administration. President Barrack Obama approved the proposed 7.5 billion USD to provide civilian related strategic assistance to Pakistan for five years under the umbrella of Kerry-Lugar Bill. This aid would overcome the flaws and weakness of the democratic government which was hampered by the nine years’ dictatorial rule of president Musharraf. During 2009, the US secretary of State inaugurated the beginning of “new era of partnership” between Pakistan and US under the presidency of Barrack Obama (Rafique, 2011). During the whole tenure of President Obama being president of the US he never paid any official visit to Pakistan. The personal choices of his administration to build strong ties with the Indian

government brought nervousness inside Pakistan and they were indicating President Obama policies to make “master India” in the policy of Obama administration which can lead to the disability and unbalancing of the region. The authorities of Pakistan were in panic situation due to the increasing ties of India and US during the Obama administration because Pakistan and India shares old rivalry on many extraordinary border related disputes. Moreover, the experts of International relations and many leading experts were of the view that the organization created between Pakistan and US has been suspicious because of the avoiding stance of President Obama on the Kashmir dispute which can lead both Pakistan and India to a potential war situation. The President Obama administration seemed to put out all his weightage in the scale of Indian government without making any reasonable offer to Pakistan which can take them into confidence to manage the matters of the region (Mehrish, 2012)

Additionally, when Afghanistan established close ties with the Indian government during October, 2011 which were producing adverse effects on Pakistan. Both Pakistan and Afghanistan shares 2400 km long border known as Durand Line. The association of both India and Afghanistan can pose vital threats for the security purposes of Pakistan. The Obama administration that was controlling the government and almost all the territory in Afghanistan did not intervene in this whole scenario. The association of hostile countries towards another country can destabilize the situation in the South Asian territory which can cause negative impacts on the national interests of the Obama administration as well. The government of Pakistan wanted the strategic intervention of the Obama administration to stop the Indian related interventions on its border side but the Obama administration did not respond to the demands of Pakistan on positive side. The relations between Pakistan and USA during the Obama administration took another bitter turn when Raymond Davis who was employee in the US office located in Lahore killed two young boys without any proper reason. There was a proper backlash and anti-American sentiments in the whole Pakistan including civilians and the elected democratic government. The President Obama policy to release and evacuate Raymond Davis without proper trial made the relations sour between the both countries. The Obama administration called the Raymond Davis act as preservation and self-defense to kill innocent young boys and Pakistani authorities surrendered in front of Obama administration and he was released after living in short custody (Mitchell, 2011). The authorities in Pakistan charged Raymond Davis on Homicide and Barrack Obama called him as being “our representative” later on CIA confirmed that he was their man to track down the activist movements inside the Pakistan’s territory (Lieven, 2012). Furthermore, Senator John Kerry paid an official visit to Pakistan to reduce the tensions escalating between Pakistan and USA. He expressed his deepest condolences on behalf of the Obama administration over the loss of precious young lives (Krasner, 2012). During the same month the Director of CIA held talks with the chief of ISI to negotiate the discharge of Raymond Davis. On March 16, 2011, 2.3 million USD were paid to the families of the victims and he was set free and flown back to the US (Alam, 2019)

The Obama administration policy of capturing or killing the terrorist elements regardless of border and state paid dividend when they conducted successful operation against Osama Bin Laden. Obama administration on May 2, 2012 launched “Operation Neptune Spear” where they killed the Al-Qaeda chief Osama bin laden. His compound was found in heavily populated city of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa region which is almost a mile away from Pakistan chief military institute named Pakistan Military Academy. The devised commission who worked on the technical aspects of the Abbottabad operation, US have not published their report publicly. It has produced the confusion in the mind and thoughts of every human being concerned with Osama bin Laden in the world. If Osama Bin Laden the world most wanted terrorist been there in that compound then the main question arose in the mind of everyone that why American officials did not published his dead body pictures. According to the Obama administration narrative they have killed Osama bin Laden and thrown his

dead body in the Arabian Sea. It made the position of Pakistan far much worst in the International community. The Obama administration did not inform the government of Pakistan in advance to share the details of the “Operation Neptune Spear”. The Obama administration policy to attack terrorist in any part of the world made Pakistan embarrassed in front of the whole world. The sacrifices made by Pakistan were forgotten due to the single operation of the US marines in Abbottabad (Wilson et al., 2011). Therefore, President Obama in his speech told: “These facts compel us to act along with our friends and allies. Our overarching goal remains the same: to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and to prevent its capacity to threaten America and our allies in the future” (Obama, 2009)

The basic question which was in everyone’s mind across the globe that why President Barack Obama launched his adventurous “Operation Neptune Spear” in the city of Abbottabad? Fuel has already been added when the US troops conducted operation against Osama Bin Laden in Pakistan in shape of surgical strike. The answer of the question was answered by many experts of the International relations that the Obama administration purposely disturbed the sovereignty of Pakistan. As mentioned before this area was heavily populated and the UN directions over the sovereignty of the nations it was expected that Pakistan would assist the US troops if they asked for their support and assistance. After this adventure of President Barack Obama, Pakistan government and civilians asked for strict actions which resulted in the closure of borders for the NATO troops fighting the war against terrorism in Afghanistan. The Obama administration in response was quick to apologize to Pakistan and their apology ended this episode. Moreover, after the incident of Abbottabad operation the relations of Pakistan and US became sour according to the situation. The Obama administration did not take firm steps to overcome the distances created by his administration to smooth down the relations of the both countries. There was definite hatred among the politicians and common public towards America and President Obama administration due to Pakistan’s sovereignty issues. The Obama administration policy to neglect and ignore the sentiments of the public of Pakistan made the situation even more worst. He requested the military establishment of Pakistan to diffuse the situation; the Inter Service Public Relations Director General released a statement that this incident will not impact the relations of both Pakistan and America (Deeks, 2011). Furthermore, during October 2011, the “Memogate” emergence has disturbed the domestic politics of Pakistan. The civil military relations became aggressive due to the outrage of this scandal. It costed Hussain Haqqani his job and made the position of President Asif Ali Zardari very strong in his narrative. Both Haqqani and President Zardari denied the allegations associated with them in “memogate scandal”. Prime Minister Yousef Raza Gillani in his statement told that “connivances are being incubated to pack up the chose government” further on Gillani added while addressing to military establishment “can’t be a state inside a state” and at last he stated that “Parliament is responsible for handling the affairs of the country”. Some prominent experts were of the view that the administration of President Barack Obama has been trying to move his foreign policy agenda’s towards Pakistan. There were speculations that Barack Obama administration through the “memogate” wanted to alter the political structure of Pakistan to overcome some failed foreign policy arrangements in the region. Some analysts described it “central threatening vibe” towards the government of Pakistan which will hurt the civil and military establishment not the public (Fischer and Schultz, 2012).

The Salala incident on November 26, 2011 made the relations of both Pakistan and US under the administration of President Barack Obama to a hostile extent. The NATO helicopters and Jets attacked the Pakistan military office with heavy bombs resulting in deaths of 27 security personnel. During this incident 14 personnel got injured (Pirzada, 2011). The Pakistani authorities condemned the attacks as inhumane and called this attack as the relation breaker between Pakistan and US. As a result, Pakistan blocked the Khyber supply line for the NATO troops in Afghanistan and the

evacuation of US troops from Shamsi airbase was demanded from the Obama administration (Cordesman, 2009).

Moreover, these were some of the trends of the foreign policy of Barrack Obama for Pakistan. Every point will be discussed in detailed in the following section of the research study will elaborate incidents and his policy towards Pakistan. The president Barrack Obama policy for Pakistan revolved under the following points for Pakistan.

- a) Drone attacks
- b) Infiltration of US and NATO troops into the territories of Pakistan in “hot pursuit”
- c) Using Pakistan territory and Air Bases to provide sustainability in Afghanistan war
- d) Provoked attacks of NATO and ISAF
- e) Non- Military aid
- f) Strategic relations with India while ignoring Pakistan
- g) Dominating Political affairs of Pakistan

Pakistan in reply reviewed the strategic policy of President Obama and passed 14 points agenda demanding his administration to correct them which are the representation of his Foreign Policy for Pakistan. These points were passed from the “Pakistan’s Parliamentary Review of the Bilateral Relationship” in 2012:

- a) “Immediate cessation of U.S.-launched] drone attacks inside the territory of Pakistan”
- b) “Cessation of infiltration into Pakistani territory on any pretext, including ‘hot pursuit”
- c) “Pakistani territory including its air space shall not be used for transportation of arms and ammunition to Afghanistan”
- d) “The condemnable and unprovoked NATO/ISAF attack ... represents a breach of international law and constitutes a blatant violation of Pakistan’s sovereignty and territorial integrity,” and “the government of Pakistan should seek an unconditional apology from the United States”
- e) “Those held responsible for the (Salala incident) should be brought to justice”
- f) “No verbal agreement regarding national security shall be entered into by the government” and “all such agreements or understandings shall cease to have effect forthwith”
- g) “No overt or covert operations inside Pakistan shall be permitted”;
- h) “No private security contractors and/or intelligence operatives shall be allowed”
- i) “Pakistan’s territory will not be provided for the establishment of any foreign bases.” (Kronstadt, 2012)

Political Setting of Pakistan during President Barrack Obama

The political setting of Pakistan was different when President Obama assumed the charges as President of the US. The relations of Pakistan and USA after the era of cold war were based on the alliance in war against terrorism. After the brutal attacks of Al-Qaeda on World Trade Center and Pentagon US launched attack against Al-Qaeda and Taliban. During that era President Bush took President Musharraf in confidence to fight war against terrorism. President accepted the challenge to play crucial part in the war against terrorism (Rohde, 2012). The Bush administration pushed President Musharraf to bring proper democracy in Pakistan after attaining some strategic goals and objectives in the region. On February 18, 2008 Pakistan has witnessed free and fair election since its inception and international media applauded the fairness through which the election commission of Pakistan and other stakeholders helped Pakistan in conducting these elections (Nelson, 2009). The Pakistan People’s Party (PPP) under the leadership of Asif Ali Zardari came into power PPP and other stakeholders were favoring the impeachment of President Musharraf after assuming the power. It laid the foundations for the resignation of President Musharraf and he resigned from the post of

Presidency after six months of PPP assuming the powers. It has finished the dictatorial government of President Musharraf and Pakistan yet again was back on track towards democracy. The resignation of President Musharraf has solved the problem of democracy but still Pakistan was going through tough time it was facing severe economic problems, Islamic militancy, poverty was on the peak, existence of anti government elements and terrorist attacks. The problem of Pakistan can be classically defined as “chicken and egg” problem of the newly elected democratic government of Pakistan (Ahmed and Hussain, 2016). On 18 February 2008, for the first time in Pakistan’s 61-year history, a relatively free and fair national election brought about a peaceful transition of power after a government had completed its full term in office, setting the stage for General Pervez Musharraf’s resignation from the presidency six months later. Yet even given these favorable conditions, democracy in Pakistan may be derailed by deep-seated problems that democracy, by itself, cannot solve, including rising Islamist militancy, anti government feeling, and deepening poverty among masses of young people. Pakistan now faces the classic “chicken-and-egg” problem of democratic development (Goodson, 2008).

Barrack Obama Doctrine before Presidency

The technical terminology of “Obama Doctrine” was used way before his assumption of office as president of USA. Foreign policy goals and its execution was integral part during the presidential campaign. The renowned scholar and author James Kirchick has beautifully summarized the terminology of Obama Doctrine way before his presidency in his article published in Providence Journal on August 28, 2007. According to James Kirchick “The United State will not remain impassive in the face of genocide” President Barrack Obama, in his meeting with the associate press on July 7, 2007 he told them that US would not indulge its military to protect and take care of the issues related to humanity. Further, he added the potential killings in Iraq are not enough evidence to keep the American troops on the soil of Iraq (Goldberg, 2018). During the Presidential debate of President Barrack Obama with John McCain, President Obama talked about the national interest and its core principles in his foreign policy. He explained the framework through which he would pursue his foreign policy. At the end of the debate he told that it would be hard for his administration to carry further humanitarian interventions in the world (Aqromi, 2011). Later on going deep into his election campaign President Obama openly shared his thoughts regarding his foreign policy by stating that his doctrine would not be as rigid as Bush Doctrine. He explained that he would bring proper balance between the use of hard power and soft power. The statements during his election campaign clearly suggest that his administration would not even consider its internal and external security and prosperity of US as nation in comparison with the different countries of the world (Fraser, 2009). This doctrine was the illustration to build a regulatory framework which in the start finished the politics of apprehension and it moved towards a shallow space, laid a foundation of proper democratic framework with strategic interventions which would improve the dignity of America as a nation who are showing hostility to Americanism and its democratic norms (Ackerman, 2008). The renowned member of the Weekly Standards Dean Barnett criticized the Bush Doctrine by calling it immature and inexperienced attitude towards planning of policy. Further, he criticized that it was not the climate of fear which laid the foundations of Islamic extremism but rather it was something malevolent (Dreier, 2009).

Furthermore, Lynn Sweet from Chicago Sun Times commented and analyzed the speech which was delivered by President Obama on July 15, 2008 during his election campaign at Woodrow Wilson Center he categorically used the term “Obama Doctrine”. During his speech, President Obama explained the five main pillars of his foreign policy to deal with international environment (Sweet, 2008). These pillars were:

- a) To finish the war in Iraq successfully

- b) To finish the war on terror against Al-Qaeda and Taliban
- c) Securing nuclear weapons from terrorist states to establish peace and stability
- d) To accomplish honest and sincere energy security
- e) Reestablishing cooperation's and cooperative alliances to meet the global challenges

These pillars were the reflections of his policies which he had previously explained in an essay named "Renewing American Leadership" which was written during the summer in Foreign Affairs magazine (Obama, 2008).

Obama Doctrine as President

After fighting wars in President Bush Administration the hatred and anti-American sentiments were on peak when President Obama assumed office. The attacks launched on Afghanistan in which more than 80,000 Pakistani's lost their precious lives, invasion on Iraq and threatening of Iran erupted these sentiments. The integral part of President Obama foreign policy became to reach out the Muslim countries and to take them into confidence. To explain the future relations of the Obama administration with the Muslim world he delivered a speech on June 4, 2009 in Cairo University titled "A new Beginning" in which he talked about the US policies to pursue its diplomatic and bilateral relations with the Muslim countries of the world. The observers and scholars declared it the emergence of Obama Doctrine which would give US foreign policy a new and fresh dimension (Limbert, 2010). He stated in his speech: "We meet at a time of great tension between the United States and Muslims around the world tension rooted in historical forces that go beyond any current policy debate. The relationship between Islam and the West includes centuries of coexistence and cooperation, but also conflict and religious wars. More recently, tension has been fed by colonialism that denied rights and opportunities to many Muslims, and a Cold War in which Muslim-majority countries were too often treated as proxies without regard to their own aspirations. Moreover, the sweeping change brought by modernity and globalization led many Muslims to view the West as hostile to the traditions of Islam" (Obama, 2009)

The different actions and choices of President Obama was clear indication to control the damage caused during Bush Doctrine. These policies were supported by closing of detention center of the famous Guantanamo Bay where majority of the Muslims from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and people from other part of the world were detained. The refusal of his administration to prolong the "Global War on Terror", the compromising attitude with Putin led Russia on strategic assets on the expense of Poland and Czech Republic. These were the defining choices which were included in President Obama foreign policy as compared with Bush foreign policies (Simpson, 2012). In the backdrop of these events Pat Buchanan a famous American conservative political observer, correspondent, legislator, and journalist criticized the foreign policies of President Barack Obama, he told that it will further deteriorate the policies of US and President Obama is giving moral support to those countries that does not deserve such moral support (Vik, 2015). Furthermore, Daniel Drezner the famous International Relations Professor and commentator described Obama Doctrine has been deeply influenced by Montesquieu a renowned French theorist, according to him those conflicts which are useless automatically plays its role in weakening of essential conflicts. It clearly suggests that foreign policy of President Obama has the main goal which is to avoid objective less and infamous policies. Therefore, Obama Doctrine has focused on more relevant and more persistent matters concerning to US (Drezner, 2009). Moreover, E.j. Dionne composed serial of sections in the Washington Post where he considered the Obama Doctrine authentic, courageous enough to deploy the American troops where he felt the need and the self-awareness and calculated foreign policy decision making is shaping the foreign policy of US to next levels. Dionne also explained that Obama

Doctrine has been getting its influence from Reinhold Niebuhr and indicated the Niebuhr's warnings that few of the "the greatest perils to democracy arise from the fanaticism of moral idealists who are not conscious of the corruption of self-interest and that a nation with an inordinate degree of political power is doubly tempted to exceed the bounds of historical possibilities" (Dionne, 2009)

President Barack Obama during the Summit of the Americas held in Trinidad and Tobago. He said that the US persisted the most efficient, richest combination of states on the planet, but they were the solitary homeland, and that the problems that they tackled, whether it was drug associations, ecological change, terrorism, any other nation of the world could not bear such calamities (Hayes, 2009). More to Obama Doctrine, Obama Administration supported and implemented the policy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt of having good and positive relations with its neighbors; "The Good Neighbor Policy" was missing in President Bush Administration. He stated that US under his administration is looking forward to build good relations with its neighbors based on mutual respect and dignity where no country will be superior from another country and these relations will be built on the basis of equality (Obama, 2009). Paul Wasler, political analyst and commentator lamented this stance and he counter attacked that portraying America as "equal" among the nations of the globe would decline its worldwide image of being the most powerful country (Walser, 2010). Furthermore, Barack Obama in June 2009 explained his foreign policy towards the Muslim world in building the relations of US with the Muslim community. He emphasized to bring reforms in the undemocratic governments. The undemocratic norms have been reason of destruction in the Muslim world President Obama told in his speech (Corbin, 2009). The former Senator Chuck Hagel in the President Obama administration appreciated the efforts of President Obama in improving the relations of US in the world especially with the Muslim countries. According to him it will improve the image of US in the international community. The famous foreign policy analyst and commentator Reginald Dale was of the point that the compromising attitude of President Barack Obama has weakened the stance of US while comparing with different nations of the world. He cited the examples and compromise made by Obama towards Russian Federation, China and North Korea who can pose vital threats i.e. economic and military at any given time (Chun, 2018). The treatment of all nations on the basis of equality has been criticized by many commentators within and outside of the American during the Obama administration. They were of the view that this treatment has put the US and Israeli strategic assets programs at the equal level while comparison with the Iranian nuclear project (Wing, 2009). There were worries and deep concerns that President Barack Obama did not recognized the terrorist activities as potential threat for the survival of US and the Middle East. Other experts of International Relations criticized the lack of definition and implementation of Barack Obama Doctrine. The famous International Relations analyst Charles Krauthammer was of the view that the vision of President Obama has all the ingredients to build an effective doctrine to bring stability in the word yet according to him the Obama Doctrine needs technical punishment and improvements on technical side (Krauthammer, 2009). Furthermore, Anders Stephenson working as Professor in the University of Columbia was of the view that extreme "Pragmatic Foreign Policy" with the lack of centralized ideology could support the comeback of "American Exceptionalism" policy at any time during the Obama administration (Cox, 2016). The narrative of the Obama Doctrine came under extreme scrutiny regarding his speech at the Noble Peace Prize ceremony in December 2009 at Oslo. The participants in that Noble Peace Prize ceremony give mixed gesture at the Obama speech some applauded his policies while some gave negative feedback towards his policies in achieving the goals and objectives (Obama, 2009). During his presidency, Obama resisted for the occasional application of might in international relations as essentially needed according to the situation and needs (Sarfo and Krampa, 2013). It has been indicated by John Dickerson, the President hushed his right wing opponents who patent him as delicate, while keeping up prominence on flexible political commitment. The speech delivered by President Barack Obama was widely

praised by the conservative members in the American politics including Sarah Palin, Newt Gingrich and John Boehner (Reeves and May 2013).

Moreover, Nial Ferguson professor in Harvard University, after the “Arab Spring” he opposed that the Barrack Obama Doctrine did not comprehend the speculations which were taking place in the region. According to him it was the curse for the strategic thinking of the Obama Administration. He described that the Obama administration did not considered the situation in which the Egyptian President Hussein Mubarak was going through while fighting well known rebellion. The President Obama and the National Security Committee whole team appears to be just drafting important speeches for the president similar to the speech he delivered in Cairo University in his early days of presidency. He emphasized on ground working for the Obama Administration rather giving speeches on important occasions (Ferguson, 2017).

National Security Strategy of Barrack Obama

The National Security Strategy of Obama Administration was different from the Bush administration. The Bush administration devised his National Security strategy in peak of war against terrorism. Where Pakistan and Afghanistan became the focal point of his foreign policy, in comparison to President Bush the Obama regime came into power in rather less pressure. The Obama administration devised his National Security Strategy in May, 2010 in which he demanded the global world for more strategic engagements to tackle the issues of the world to bring peace and prosperity across the globe (Quinn, 2015). He in his National Security Strategy clearly clarified that his administration is not against the Islam and the Islamic countries. This was important for Pakistan as well because Pakistan being the Nuclear Islamic country in the world, the Obama policy of continuing the peaceful and cordial relations with the Muslim world was imperative for Pakistan. The government and people of Pakistan have suffered a lot from the US sponsored war against terrorism. The Obama administration has dropped down the terminologies such as “global war on terror” and “Islamic extremism” to give positive message to the Muslim countries under his foreign policy umbrella. He described that he will pursue the war against Al-Qaeda and their terrorist organization and the battle of the US is with terrorists regardless of religion and country not specifically with Islam (Obama, 2010). The Obama administration National Security Strategy called the world to engage the “hostile nations” to bring stability and security in the world. His policy was to build good relations with India, China and Pakistan to boost the economy of US and secure their strategic interests in the region. The Secretary of State Hillary Clinton told the promotion of fundamental and basic human rights and democracy are the main pillars of President Obama Foreign Policy. She stated that “they could not manage that was level of deficit financing and obligation without losing their impact on the global issues, without being compelled about the critical choices they needed to make” (Kaufman, 2012). Furthermore, towards the Muslim World the National Security Strategy of President Barrack Obama was suspicious about the certain alterations in his doctrine in one instance the Obama doctrine would act to build good relations on the basis of equality. On the other side the Obama administration would emphasis that US would play the role of “policemen” in the global affairs. The announcement of President Obama, his administration would protect the US national interests in the global affairs whether they would act sigillary or in alliance. He emphasized on the use of power to guard America and its citizens. It was clear indications that his administration has not been submitted to the American “war dogma” (McCormick, 2014)

Generally, the National Security Strategy highlights the important aspects and striking points of each president in American Policies. It explains their point of view and future polices for the global politics and domestic affairs of the US (Selchow, 2017). The speedy comparative analysis of the National Security Strategy of President Bush and President Obama will lead us to the conclusion

that the personality traits and the individuality in devising the foreign policy of the US play important role. Their NSS can be seen very different from each other according to situation and up to date. This document later on provides sustainability to the establishment of the US for effective implementation of those policies. After comparing the NSS of both President Bush and President Obama we conclude that non intervention can be very dangerous and lethal for the protection, success and prosperity in American context. That's why US believes in the policy of intervention whether it was Bush doctrine or Obama doctrine, US implements and apply its power in the global affairs and goes beyond its limits to penetrate the world through its military might, economic power, cyber expertise, space technology and other strategic technological interventions. Moreover, the critiques inside the United States and across the globe including the experts of International relations have identified flaws and weak points the National Security Strategy of the President Barrack Obama. The organizational level fault lines have been identified in NSS, according the member of Heritage Foundation James Carafano the position of Obama's NSS was an "an overwhelming desire to substitute soft power for hard power" and that the president "has no strategy for when the other side chooses not to cooperate, as in the case of Iran" (Carafano, 2010). The Washington Times heavily criticized the strategic policies of President Bush stating that it must not be "some kind of outreach initiative, it is the framing document for America's global safety. The US cannot effectively combat the root causes of Islamic extremism by ignoring them" (Stern, 2015). President Barack Obama on March 28, 2011 during his speech laid down his 8 points which were important for the execution of his policy goals and objectives. He laid down the foundations and limits through which US in the global world use its military power in effective manner, for the first time any administration in the US has drawn its boundaries for its military interventions in any part of the world. This was the gesture of surety from the Obama administration to the global world that US would intervene in the other countries in extreme and unavoidable conditions. The conditions discussed by Barrack Obama for his doctrine were:

- a. The prospect of fierceness on a dreadful measure.
- b. The US had the matchless aptitude to halt the violence
- c. A worldwide command for action.
- d. A wide-ranging partnership
- e. Backing of Arab (neighboring) nations.
- f. An appeal for assistance from the individuals themselves.
- g. The capability to stop the opponent in their trails.
- h. Without placing American soldiers on the ground (Chollett and Fishman, 2015)

President Barrack Obama Af-PAK Strategy

"As President, my greatest responsibility is to protect the American people... we are in Afghanistan to confront a common enemy that threatens the United States, our friends and allies, and the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan who have suffered the most at the hands of violent extremists. So I want the American people to understand that we have a clear and focused goal: to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return to either country in future ... To achieve our goals, we need a stronger, smarter and comprehensive strategy" (Obama, 2009)

The Pakistan and Afghanistan Strategy was first proposed by the Obama Administration. This strategy was devised after tracking the flaws and weakness found in the Bush Administration while dealing with Pakistan and Afghanistan in war against terrorism. This strategy was finalized during

March 2009 by the Obama Administration because the Bush Administration lacked in finalization of strategic policies for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Later on the strategic policy for Afghanistan and Pakistan was redefined with certain alterations and was in implementation phase during December 2009 after proper reviewing of the military officials in the US. This strategy outlined the critical aspects of the President Obama policy towards Pakistan in context to the war against terrorism to destroy Al-Qaeda in the region. Main pillars of the Obama Administration AF-APAK strategy were a “to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al-Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return to either country in the future.” (Fair, 2010) Therefore President Obama stated in his speech: “Today, I’m announcing a comprehensive, new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. And this marks the conclusion of a careful policy review, led by Bruce that I ordered as soon as I took office. My administration has heard from our military commanders, as well as our diplomats. We’ve consulted with the Afghan and Pakistani governments, with our partners and our NATO allies, and with other donors and international organizations” (Obama, 2009). This strategy came out in a critical time from the Obama administration where Pakistan needed utmost assistance from the international community to fight the US sponsored war against terrorism. The economic and human infrastructure of Pakistan faced severe problems because of the war against terrorism. Pakistan was attacked from both internal and external sources due to the war against terrorism. The President Obama strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan promised broad range of assistance and cooperation for Pakistan who was acting as front line state in fighting the war against Al-Qaeda and Taliban both domestically and on Afghanistan border. The promise of Obama Administration appealed the international community to help out Pakistan as coalition partner in overcoming the political, economic and security related challenges. According to Obama administration this was the one way in which Pakistan can move on the path of development which will help the Americans to protect their interests in the region as well as combating the terrorists and terrorist organizations operating in the region (Ahmed, 2010). On another occasion while addressing to the nation regarding Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy President Obama stated: “The future of Afghanistan is inextricably linked to the future of its neighbor, Pakistan. In the nearly eight years since 9/11, al Qaeda and its extremist allies have moved across the border to the remote areas of the Pakistani frontier. This almost certainly includes al Qaeda's leadership: Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri. They have used this mountainous terrain as a safe haven to hide, to train terrorists, to communicate with followers, to plot attacks, and to send fighters to support the insurgency in Afghanistan. For the American people, this border region has become the most dangerous place in the world. But this is not simply an American problem -- far from it” (Obama, 2009)

The government of Pakistan showed its deep reservation about some strategic points in the Obama AF-PAK strategy. The Obama administration in this strategy has showed the Pakistan and Afghanistan border which is 2400 km long as one entity or single zone for the military operations purposes. Pakistan stance was strong regarding the border that Pakistan and Afghanistan are different countries having different borders. This border has different dynamics as well. This border has played vital role in the war against terrorism on Pakistan’s side. The Obama administration through his Afghanistan and Pakistan strategy was considering both the countries same while fighting the war against Al-Qaeda and Taliban. The President of Pakistan Asif Ali Zardri has criticized the Obama administration regarding his policy to combine two regional countries having different dynamics and ground realities under one single strategy. His interview with the financial times further clarified the stance of Pakistan government where President Asif Ali Zardari categorically told that Pakistan and Afghanistan are totally different countries from each other in South Asian Territory both the countries had different political history and they cannot be united under the technical intervention of the same framework under the same strategy (Ahmed, 2010 pp 195-199). To further evaluate the above mentioned statements of the Pakistan government, Pakistan possess well established democratic government having 180 million of population in President Obama

administration. It possessed well established and technically correct military which had nuclear capability for deterrence. It has very influential bunch of individuals across the globe having stable economic conditions of the middle class. Pakistan had better print and electronic media which has the capability to change the perspective of the people at international level. On the other hand, Afghanistan has been war ridden country for three decades till Obama administration. There is no implementation of democracy in Afghanistan where drug trafficking is predominantly common with poor check and balance. The government of Afghanistan does not perform its executive functions outside the territory of Kabul. The common threat to both Pakistan and Afghanistan was the threat of internal and external terrorist activities. On the basis of the above valid reasons the government of Pakistan showed its reservations on Obama's AF-PAK Strategy by linking both the countries and treats them as one entity against Taliban and Al-Qaeda would definitely impacts the historic and long lasting strategic relations of Pakistan and USA. Therefore, President Barrack Obama stated in his speech: "So I want the American people to understand that we have a clear and focused goal: to disrupt, dismantle and defeat al Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return to either country in the future. That's the goal that must be achieved. That is a cause that could not be more just. And to the terrorists who oppose us, my message is the same: We will defeat you" (Obama, 2009)

The President Obama Afghanistan and Pakistan strategy put Pakistan in the hotspot by putting great emphasis and trust on its ability to counter attack and dismantle the terrorists. It has attracted the need of more economic and military assistance for Pakistan's sustainability to fight the war against terrorism on global level. The economic and military assistance under the Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy for Pakistan will be evaluated on the basis of Pakistan's performance in combating terrorists and terrorist's organizations (Ali, 2010). The administration of President Obama has recognized the highs and lows in the relations of Pakistan and USA. The overcoming of "trust deficit" in his Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy was to fill the gaps of mistrust between the relations of the both countries. The devised Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy further elaborates the working relationship of the Obama administration to engage the common public of Pakistan as commitment for long term to build the economy, democracy and divergent civil society of Pakistan (Caldwell, 2011). The administration of President Obama recognized the importance of Pakistan and he implemented technical interventions to improve and strengthen the relations of USA with Pakistan. The previous administration of President Bush has the trend in his policy to pressurize Pakistan on the basis of "do more" while Pakistan was losing precious military and civilian lives. Unlike President Bush, the administration of President Obama realized that the rhetoric of chanting "do more" proved to be failed strategy from the administration of President Bush. The administration of President Barrack Obama emphasized on offering Pakistan economic and military assistance to achieve his goals under the umbrella of Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy. His administration and the technical support staff knew that for peaceful, prosper and stable Afghanistan the cooperation and diplomatic support of Pakistan will play vital role. The reason behind strengthening the diplomatic ties with Pakistan was to combat terrorism on the Afghanistan soil which is very important for the peace and security of the region. Moreover, the basic theme of the President Barrack Obama Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy was to rebuild those sectors of Pakistan which was badly impacted due to the US sponsored war against terrorism. His administration offered substantial support of his government to assist Pakistan in the following sectors:

- a) To build and modernize the agriculture sector of Pakistan through technical interventions
- b) To create more jobs in multi-disciplinary fields to overcome the poverty issues
- c) HR Capacity building in different sectors of Pakistan for efficient service delivery
- d) To facilitate and provide support to Pakistan in infrastructure related sectors
- e) Reconstruction and Rehabilitation of war ridden areas (FATA and Swat)

The steps taken by the President Obama Administration under the Afghanistan and Pakistan Strategy was to produce some viable results in the war against terrorism. For this reason, he built friendly relations with Pakistan by offering them the civilian and military aid to justify his stance on the war against terrorism. The main theme of his strategy was to have check and balance on both Pakistan and Afghanistan to achieve his strategic goals and objectives in the region (Markey, 2009).

Appointment of Special Representative for Pakistan in Obama Administration

President Barack Obama after taking oath as the new president of the United States of America, he announced the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as special envoy for the war ridden Pakistan and Afghanistan. Richard Holbrooke served as diplomat in the Clinton administration previously having vast experience in diplomatic related issues and challenges. The appointment of Richard Holbrooke came after two days of President Obama taking office as the new President of the USA replacing President Bush (Khan, 2009). President Barack Obama while addressing to the nation he nominated Richard Holbrooke by stating: “We must recognize the fundamental connection between the future of Afghanistan and Pakistan -- which is why I've appointed Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, who is here, to serve as Special Representative for both countries, and to work closely with General Petraeus to integrate our civilian and military efforts” (Obama, 2009). The administration of President Barack Obama assigned the duty to Richard Holbrooke to coordinate with Pakistan and Afghanistan and report back to the Obama administration regarding the status and position of the American interests in the region. Beside coordination his main responsibility was to monitor and then evaluate the situation of war against terrorism in Pakistan and Afghanistan and to present the situational analysis to the Obama administration. The appointment of special representative who will work on Afghanistan and Pakistan was missing the Bush administration previously. This was a masterstroke on behalf of the Obama administration to appoint the focal person for this region. Through this appointment he achieved his goals and objectives in smart manner. The Secretary of State has strongly recommended and approved the decision of appointing special representative due to the requirement of special attention on the troubled and aggressive Pakistan and Afghanistan relations (Mohan, 2009).

While accepting the job as representative of Pakistan and Afghanistan, Richard Holbrooke declared the situation of Pakistan “infinitely complex”. Where the terrorism and domestic situation linked with the global war against terrorism was so complex and aggressive. The political administrations in Pakistan in relations with the other stakeholders were in constant struggle of power which was clearly hampering the efforts of Pakistan in the war against terrorism. The situation of Pakistan economy was moving on downsides. The education, health and institutional infrastructure were in very bad conditions. The democratic norms were recently restored in Pakistan after the resignation of President Musharraf. There was constant battle between power between the civil and military establishments. The assessment of the complexity of Pakistan Richard Holbrooke noted and coordinated with the administration of Barack Obama the need of “clearly chaotic foreign assistance program” for Pakistan (Kulish and Cooper, 2009). Furthermore, way before the appointment of Richard Holbrooke there were speculations and talks about the appointment of special representative on a broader perspective in Obama administration. Many experts were of the view that the special representative will be taking care of the US strategic objectives and policies in Pakistan, Afghanistan, India and even Kashmir. The earlier reports coming out from the office of Obama administration regarding the appointment of special representative was titled “Special Representative for Afghanistan, Pakistan, and related issues”. The latter part of the designation allotted to the special representative was omitted from the official documents. The Spokesperson of the State Department upon severe questioning responded and insisted regarding the mandate of Richard Holbrooke that his role and responsibilities will be strictly limited to the situation pertaining in Afghanistan and Pakistan (Rubin, 2013). Moreover, the reputation of Richard Holbrooke as a

“bulldozer” and his pertaining negative views about the south Asian territory. He would propagate positive narrative regarding South Asia but majority of times he would criticize or propagate his negative views about the people of South Asia. Thus his appointment as special representative to Pakistan and Afghanistan caused serious panic in the South Asian territory (Halbrook, 2009). Other experts of international Relations saw Richard Hall Brooke “dim and dismal” prospects of him. Their predication of closing down the militant sanctuaries in Pakistan was the hardest test for the abilities and capabilities of the new representative. Other analysts of the Political Science were of the view that the situation of South Asian territory did not allow the further involvements of US in the diplomatic affairs of the region. This involvement can backfire any moment which can disturb the peace and security of the region. The sovereignty should be respected of each and every state regardless of border and ideological frameworks. They demanded a measured and calculated approach on behalf of the Obama Administration for the creation of more articulated and inclusive US regional strategy for the South Asian Territory (Packer, 2019)

President Obama Policies on War against Terrorism

After the brutal attacks of 9/11, President Bush declared Al-Qaeda to be the top listed target in his strategic policies. His announcement of war against terrorism to dismantle Al-Qaeda and Taliban was to safeguard the world from further terrorist activities and to protect the national interests of the US in the region. His statement regarding the attack on Afghanistan: “He would take action to preclude not only imminent threats but also gathering ones, and would act alone if necessary” (Leffler, 2001 p. 34). Under this aggressive stance he launched war in Afghanistan and Iraq during 2003. The Bush administration policies of pre-emptive and preventive strategic foreign policies did not achieve the desired goals and objectives as it was expected from his administration. His foreign policy has created a lot of mess for the US not in South Asian territory but at international level as well. Due to the war mongering policies of President Bush the domestic economic conditions of the US started to deteriorate. During the year 2008, after completing his reign the people of the US were confronted to choose the new President for them. The US two party system, from the Republicans party they nominated Senator John McCain while Democrats has no hesitation in nominating Senator Barack Obama as their presidential candidate. The policies of Senator Barack Obama and Senator John McCain were far much different from each other before contesting the presidential elections. Barack Obama was favoring the decrease of American troops in Afghanistan and Iraq while John McCain was in favor to send more and more troops to these countries (Brown and Scales, 2013, p. 78). Therefore, President Obama stated in his speech: “The terrorists within Pakistan's borders are not simply enemies of America or Afghanistan -- they are a grave and urgent danger to the people of Pakistan. Al Qaeda and other violent extremists have killed several thousand Pakistanis since 9/11. They've killed many Pakistani soldiers and police. They assassinated Benazir Bhutto. They've blown up buildings, derailed foreign investment, and threatened the stability of the state. So make no mistake: Al Qaeda and its extremist allies are a cancer that risks killing Pakistan from within” (Obama, 2009)

President Barack Obama after taking the oath as President of the USA on January 20, 2009 he promised to change all the wrong policies of the previous administration on war against terrorism. The President Obama opposition to the “bad war” in Iraq perspective while his narrative of “right war” in Afghanistan perspective was vital from these narrative he won the presidential elections of the US. The Obama Administration focus on “right war” in Afghanistan where his administration deployed more troops to fight the war against terrorism in an efficient manner while calling back the soldiers of the US from Iraq was his main goal in his foreign policy strategy. His administration appointed special representative in shape of seasoned diplomat Richard Halbrook to produce check and balance and he would have to play the role of coordination between the three countries in war against terrorism. The agreeing of Obama administration to deploy 30,000 more troops in

Afghanistan to fight result oriented war against Taliban and AL-Qaeda. The areas of Pakistan and Afghanistan which have become hub of the terrorist, the implementation of counter insurgency strategic plan the Obama Administration approved the appointment of General Stanley McChrystal as new US forces commander in Afghanistan (Brown and Scales pp. 79-83). There were heck of issues and challenges in the policies of Bush Administration in context to US fighting the war against terrorism while Obama administration did not agree with the policies of his administration. He was focused to change the prevailing wrong policies existing in the strategic policy of the US. The whole disagreements were derived from the presidential debate of Senator John Kerry in 2004 against the former President Bush (Hussain and Farani, 2012). Furthermore according to the statement of Senator John Kerry, "it was not in the interest of America to stay engaged in the Iraq war for a longer period of time, as it was costing a lot to the taxpaying American citizens and the US forces, given the US objectives in Afghanistan". His firm belief was that "America needed a viable exit strategy from Iraq, in order to have a renewed focus on the Afghan terrain via a vigorous policy on Afghan war against terror" (Hussain and Farani, 2012, p. 30). Before become the president of the USA, President Obama voted against the Iraq war. But regarding the war in Afghanistan special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan Richard Halbrooke pointed out that "We've inherited a situation of grand rhetoric and inadequate resources, both military and civilian. We need to understand what our goal is in Afghanistan" (Traynor, 2009) President Barack Obama while addressing at Air Force Base Tempa Macdill Florida stated: "Meanwhile, al Qaeda had regrouped in the border region of Afghanistan and Pakistan, and was actively planning attacks against our homeland. So we brought nearly 150,000 troops home from Iraq, consistent with the Status of Forces Agreement negotiated by the previous administration, and we surged our efforts along with our allies in Afghanistan, which allowed us to focus on dismantling al Qaeda and give the Afghan government the opportunity to succeed" (Obama, 2016)

So from the above statement of the Obama administration it was evident that the US has been withdrawing their forces from Iraq and will be focusing on Afghanistan and Pakistan to fight the war against terrorism in the region. Further on in the same speech President Barack Obama stated: "Of course, the terrorist threat was never restricted to South Asia, or to Afghanistan, or Pakistan. Even as al Qaeda has been decimated in Afghanistan and Pakistan, the threat from terrorists metastasized in other parts of the Middle East and North Africa. And most dangerously, we saw the emergence of ISIL, the successor to al Qaeda in Iraq, which fights as both a terrorist network and an insurgency" (Obama, 2016). This statement of President Barack Obama clearly suggest that the threats of terrorism and extremism has not been expanded to Afghanistan and Pakistan, but the main hub and masterminds of some of the terrorist attacks were from Middle Eastern countries and from North African continent. This statement clearly suggests that the Obama administration was looking to combat the terrorist activities not only in Pakistan and Afghanistan but in reality he was targeting other part of the world to dismantle terrorist and their organizations to maintain peace and security of the world. President Barack Obama while taking the Americans in confidence during his speech in 2013 he stated:

"Fewer of our troops are in harm's way, and over the next 19 months they will continue to come home...Today, the core of al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is on the path to defeat. Their remaining operatives spend more time thinking about their own safety than plotting against us. They did not direct the attacks in Benghazi or Boston. They've not carried out a successful attack on our homeland since 9/11" (Cordesman, 2013).

President Obama Policies on Stabilizing Afghanistan through Pakistan

President Barack Obama's intentions to stabilize Afghanistan were critical part of his strategic policy. He increased the American troops to a considerable number in order to achieve proper

stability in Afghanistan. The stability of Afghanistan cannot be achieved through the help of Pakistan. The administration of President Barrack Obama knew that Pakistan technical and moral support can play vital role in the stability of Afghanistan. The new approach of the Obama administration to Pakistan was to develop more comprehensive and concise strategic policies to give Pakistan more military aid which would help out the government of Pakistan in combating the war against terrorism (Ra'ees, 2010). Under the new approach the Obama government delivered nonmilitary aid to Pakistan to make the lives of the people of Pakistan special focus was given to the people of FATA. The key members of the Obama administration including President Obama, Vice President Joe Biden and Secretary of State Hilary Clinton supported the "enhanced partnership with Pakistan" act during the 110th meeting of the congress. After the approval of this act Vice President John Kerry told that this aid will require great deal of accountability and responsibility on part of Pakistan's political and military establishments he called Pakistan "ground zero for the terrorist threat we face" (Kerry, 2009). These acts and demands to support Pakistan in every sector were purely based of the war against terrorism. The US and Pakistani troops had dismantled the terrorists and terrorist's organization from Pakistan and Afghanistan successfully. Now the Obama administration was looking for the stability and peace in Afghanistan. The government and some high level individuals of Pakistan had deep relations with the government of Afghanistan including leading figures of Taliban as well.

The President Obama administration along with his technical team came to conclusion that the problem of Afghanistan cannot be solved without correcting Pakistan. The peace and stability of both countries are directly correlated with each other in peace and stability aspects. President Barrack Obama emphasized on the problem of Afghanistan would not be "solved" without "solving" the issues and problems in Pakistan which can prove vital for the peace and stability of the region. President Barrack Obama said: "What I want to do is to create the kind of effective, strategic partnership with Pakistan that allows us, in concert, to assure that terrorists are not setting up safe havens in some of these border regions between Pakistan and Afghanistan. So far President Zardari has sent the right signals. He's indicated that he recognizes this is not just a threat to the United States, but it is a threat to Pakistan as well. ... I think this democratically-elected government understands that threat and I hope that in the coming months that we're going to be able to establish the kind of close, effective, working relationship that makes both countries safer" (Jaffrelot, 2016). The United States of America after realizing that hard power is not the solution to all problems and issues. The tools of negotiation and engaging other stakeholders to achieve peace and stability could also be implemented as technical intervention. Therefore, President Barrack Obama stated in his speech: "Next week, I'll host Prime Minister Sharif of Pakistan, and I will continue to urge all parties in the region to press the Taliban to return to peace talks and to do their part in pursuit of the peace that Afghans deserve" (Obama, 2015). The Obama administration was implementing diplomatic tools and engagements with the other countries to stop violent activities in Afghanistan. The strategy of Obama administration was to bring peace in Afghanistan with negotiations and engaging other countries of the region that had influence inside the Afghanistan territory. Pakistan became important country for the Obama administration to achieve peace and stability inside Afghanistan. President Barrack Obama offered every kind of support to Pakistan in defeating Al-Qaeda and Taliban. The administration of Barrack Obama knew that Pakistan has suffered a lot in war against terrorism and it is the time to offer them assistance and support Pakistan so they could engage the Taliban in best way for peace talks. Therefore, he stated in his speech: "It's important for the American people to understand that Pakistan needs our help in going after al Qaeda. This is no simple task. The tribal regions are vast, they are rugged, and they are often ungoverned. And that's why we must focus our military assistance on the tools, training and support that Pakistan needs to root out the terrorists. And after years of mixed results, we will not, and cannot, provide a blank check" (Obama, 2009)

The administration of President Obama to bring peace and stability started peace talks with the representatives of the Taliban in June 2013 in Doha Qatar. Pakistan played important role in bringing the Taliban's to the table of negotiations and peaceful talks which could be the starting point to end all the bloodshed on the soil of Afghanistan. President Obama stated on this occasion while addressing to G-8 summit in Northern Ireland "We anticipate there will be a lot of bumps in the road". The administration of President Obama has requested the political and military administration of Pakistan to force Taliban to bring them to peace talks. The Pakistan government and military establishment started their approach after their meeting of Secretary of State John Kerry, President Hamid Karzai and Chief of Army Staff General Ashfaq Pervez Kayani met in Brussels. The military establishment promised the Obama administration that they would do anything to bring the Taliban into peace talks (DeYoung, 2013). Some experts of the International Relations were of the view that the increasing in military personnel from USA and Pakistan could lead on to worsen the situation in Afghanistan. The idea of having productive conversation and negotiation can be fruitful in prevailing peace and stability in Afghanistan rather deploying more troops. The ideas coming from different people to reconcile with the Taliban was not a recent concept at all. It was the success of "operation enduring freedom" of both US and Pakistan which broke down the back of Al-Qaeda and Taliban and the propagation of print and electronic media that "moderate Taliban" are now ready to talk with the US to have peace and stability in Afghanistan. The President of Afghanistan Hamid Karzai was in favor to talk with the Taliban. The role of Pakistan became very important because it was given the critical responsibility to talk with the representatives of the Taliban and bring them into peace talks (Tellis, 2009). Furthermore, the President of Pakistan and Chairman of PPP Asif Ali Zardari told that Pakistan is looking keenly towards the "new beginning" in the relations of Pakistan and US in Afghanistan perspective. He told that Pakistan has done enough in fighting the war in Afghanistan and his government does not "need no lectures on our commitment" he was pointing towards the US sponsored war against terrorism. He has demanded the Obama lead US government to provide assistance in promotion of democracy and economic growth as token of appreciation in fighting the war against terrorism and a new role assigned to his government to bring peace and stability in Afghanistan (Kronstadt, 2009 p. 4). Despite the hopes of Pakistan by providing the Obama administration full support in war against and terrorism and in the stability of Afghanistan his government did not worked eagerly in settling down the Kashmir dispute through proper diplomatic measures. His administration did not give importance to this issue despite Pakistan's out of the way support in each and every aspect in Afghanistan war whether its military actions or peace process (Kronstadt, 2009 p. 5).

The basic aim of the Obama administration was to how it would achieve success in their policies towards Afghanistan and Taliban. To treat the Taliban as "armed opposition" it would help to some extent but it would involve the loss of precious human lives and infrastructure of Pakistan and Afghanistan would be on stake. To achieve victory in Afghanistan the Obama administration focused on building the government of Kabul where they can have the authority over the whole Afghanistan where they can make decisions of their own according to their own strategy. The Obama administration took the government of Pakistan onboard to make a viable peace process in Afghanistan which can be vital for the peace and security of the region. (Tellis, 2009 p-12) The early exit of the US troops in the Obama administration was not viable because the Kabul government did not have full control over the entire territory of Afghanistan. The Taliban were controlling some cities of Afghanistan and they were penetrating to challenge the Government of Afghanistan in some other provinces as well. They early exit of the US from Afghanistan would give the enemies of US a chance to promote their own national interest in the region which can be fatal for the security of the region and for the American interests as well. The Obama administration intentions of "to defeat al-Qaeda and combat extremism" could be hampered without peaceful dialogue and negotiations. The strategy of Obama administration was to improve the situation in Afghanistan and then exit he

was not in favor of giving the Taliban a cheap route (Tellis, 2009 p-15). To achieve these goals, the role of Pakistan became more important to work with the US officials in technical interventions which brought Qatar negotiations as the final product of these strategic interventions.

President Obama Policy to Provide Pakistan Assistance through Kerry-Lugar Berman Bill

The Kerry Lugar bill to assist Pakistan was passed and approved during the Obama administration. It was passed through the congress as “Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009”. It is commonly named as Kerry-Lugar which is named after two famous senators of America named John Kerry who is doing politics under the umbrella of Democrats and Dick Lugar is representative of Republican Party. These seasoned politicians were the main architect of drafting the Kerry-Lugar Bill. The senate committee approved the Kerry-Lugar bill unanimously in July 2009, passed from the congress in September 2009 and President Barrack Obama signed the bill on October 15, 2009 (Subramaniam, 2009). Through this Bill the American government under the leadership of Barrack Obama appreciated the efforts of the Pakistan government and civilians in battling the bloody war against terrorism. Through this bill the government of Pakistan would receive 1.5 billion dollars’ nonmilitary for the span of 5 years which starts from the year 2009. It was civilian target aid to make Pakistan stronger in health, education and infrastructure and this aid has nothing to do with military. The people of Pakistan including the sitting government of Asif Ali Zardari appreciated and accepted this aid. The people of Pakistan badly needed this kind of aid to boost Pakistan after the destruction of war on terror (Rafique, 2011 p- 270). Some of the main objectives of Kerry-Lugar bill under the Obama administration were:

- a) Pakistan would provide its cooperation and assistance to discourage the supplies of the materials closely linked with producing of nuclear weapons. The government of Pakistan would provide the information to the US regarding supply of nuclear weaponry
- b) Pakistan would show its practical commitment during the present year to destroy and neutralize the terrorists and terrorist organizations operating in Pakistan
- c) Pakistan would keep on showing its progress in ceasing support to the terrorists and their organizations, neutralizing anti-US elements inside the Military establishment and other agencies working on intelligence sharing and all those elements that attacked or against the agenda of the US.
- d) Pakistan will ban all the terrorist organizations operating in different cities and provinces of Pakistan. The organization like Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammad should be banned from immediate effect. The camps and sanctuaries of the terrorists should be destroyed in FATA region of Pakistan. The destruction of terrorist camps in Quetta and Muridke were demanded. Pakistan was bound to share intelligence information regarding high profiled terrorist targets
- e) Pakistan would reform and strengthen its laws related to counter terrorism. The laws regarding money laundering were included to stop the flow of black money to the terrorist organizations.
- f) The military establishments or the security forces will not interfere in the political and judicial matters of Pakistan (Ashraf, 2009).

The Obama administration was of the view that this legislation and assistance would provide the Obama administration the full authority to attack and damage the terrorist and terrorist organization to further extent. The utilization of the territory of Pakistan was in their strategic policies. The Obama administration was not thinking about Al-Qaeda and Taliban only he was also targeting the small terrorist organization that has the potential and capability to hurt the interests of the US in this region and at global level as well. Similarly, the Kerry-Lugar Berman bill basic essence was to: “To build

schools and roads and hospitals and strengthen Pakistani democracy... so to avoid the mistakes of the past” (Najam, 2020). Furthermore, Pakistan under the umbrella of Kerry-Lugar Berman bill received 7.5 billion USD nonmilitary aid to strengthen the loopholes in the civil sectors of Pakistan. The prime purpose of this bill was to bring reforms in the police sector of Pakistan, to improve and strengthen the infrastructure of Pakistan, Institutional and HR Capacity building in democracy and judiciary of Pakistan, strengthen health and education sectors of Pakistan and other developmental initiatives were part of the Kerry-Lugar Berman Bill. The Secretary of State Hilary Clinton while visiting Pakistan during 2009 announced that Pakistan will be receiving 243 million USD more assistance to strengthen its power and energy sector, to strengthen the higher education department so it can compete on international levels and other initiatives which would enable Pakistan to achieve its socio-economic targets in a better way (Ahmed, 2010). The Kerry-Lugar erupted problems and controversies in the political matters of Pakistan and the situation went on to high complex levels. As we all know that this bill is meant to give nonmilitary economic assistance to Pakistan so the “Army, people, parliament on one side, president on the other”. The president of Pakistan Asif Ali Zardari considered this bill the “victory of democracy” on the other hand the political opponents of Pakistan including the military establishment kept on criticizing him. The Obama administration masterstroke through the Kerry-Lugar Berman bill was to establish civil supremacy in Pakistan because the military establishment has been involved in the politics of Pakistan throughout its inception. He prevented the military establishment in interfering into the politics. The Obama administration and President Zardari give them a positive message that they should be working on one aspect which is their prime duty and that is to protect the boundaries of Pakistan and to dismantle terrorist and terrorist organizations. The Obama administration took the surety from the military establishment that they would use all their energies against the militant organization like Lashkar-i-Taiba and Jaish-i-Mohammad to ensure that they have not been supported from the territory of Pakistan (Subramaniam, 2009).

The manner in which the Kerry-Lugar Berman bill was treated in Pakistan, it was obvious that the Obama administration in building the relations with Pakistan through this bill has backfired. According to military and civil establishments it was perceived to be a task list assigned from the administration to Pakistan and they are giving Pakistan the money for completion of each and every task. The clause in the Kerry Lugar Berman bill was clear cut interference in the internal affairs of the Pakistan and it has given the Obama administration the power and functions to intervene into the domestic affairs of Pakistan which can proved to be very lethal towards Pakistan. The Obama administration through this bill by declaring Pakistan as hub of the terrorism has wasted all the sacrifices of the government of Pakistan and the people of Pakistan they have given into the war on terror for almost a decade. The trust deficit between Pakistan and USA came on to the surface on a strategic level. Overall this bill has produced hatred in Pakistan for overcoming this hatred a major diplomatic campaign was launched by the Obama administration in Pakistan. To improve the image of Pakistan and to spread positive message the Secretary of State Hilary Clinton visited Pakistan in 2009. She held unscripted and open debates “Town Hall” with the common people of Pakistan majority of them was from civil society and students of different universities. She paid her respect and visited some of the holy shrines located at Islamabad and Lahore. This diplomatic campaign of the Obama administration did not work as they wanted to be, in June 2010 according to “Pew Research Center Polls” only 17% of the Pakistan’s had the positive views regarding America and Obama administration (Najam, 2020). The media in Pakistan has highlighted the Kerry-Lugar Berman bill declaring sensational adventure in Pakistan. The experts and some politicians in Pakistan were of the view that this bill will “bind Pakistan to America in a manner and to the extent that has never existed before”. Their narrative regarding terrorism in the Kerr-Lugar Berman bill was considered far much stronger than its initial draft approved from the House of Senate. The bill reflects that:

- a) Pakistan should stop all kind of support to the terrorists and terrorist organizations
- b) The demand of closing all the terrorist camps were demanded
- c) The faster and effective role of Pakistan was demanded to tackle with terrorism (Hippel & Shahid, 2009)

These conditions were the reflection of the narrative that Pakistan is sponsoring and supporting terrorism and it was highly criticized in the print and electronic media of Pakistan. In comparison to the House of Senate version of the Kerry-Lugar Berman Bill it was far much softer in language where it stated that Pakistan should make “concentrated efforts” to stop and dismantle terrorist organizations. (Hippel & Shahid, 2009). On the Indian perspective this bill was showing its favoritism towards India where it stated that Pakistan should ban and stop the activities of Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Muhammad to launch further attacks on its “neighboring countries” This provision was added to support the Indian government at large. This clause was added to give positive messages to the Indian government for the Obama administration regarding their strategic relations. It was criticized in the whole Pakistan that the Obama administration has been biased in safeguarding Indian national interests with the support of Pakistan (Hippel & Shahid, 2009). On the nuclear related access, the bill demanded Pakistan to provide “relevant information from or direct access to” the citizens of Pakistan who are involved in the supply of nuclear technology related networks. The stance of Pakistan was appreciated throughout the country by stating that we will work on nuclear proliferation but we will not give access to the Obama administration to the people who are being guilty of violating this clause. (Hippel & Shahid, 2009).

Congressional Hearing and US Legislation on Baluchistan

The relations of Pakistan and United States of America were mixture of good and bad relations. The relations would go friendly and in blink of the eyes these relations would become very unfriendly on the other occasion. The relationship of Pakistan and USA under the administration of President Obama was further riled in February 2012, when the “House of Foreign Affairs Subcommittee” their domain is to held investigations and close oversight over the affairs in foreign countries. They held proper hearing on the issue of Baluchistan. This is the province of Pakistan from where the separatists are demanding their own sovereign homeland. They have been funded by the enemies of Pakistan to destabilize Pakistan in each and every aspect. They demanded the partition of Pakistan into different states and Baluchistan was among one of the state, the chairman of subcommittee representative Dana Rohrabacher told the members of the Congress that the people of Baluchistan should be given the opportunity to make their own sovereign homeland for the people of Baluchistan. Therefore, the above resolution has got just on two cosponsors and it has not been reemerged from the committee till now. The attention of the congressional committee under the leadership of President Barrack Obama made the government of Pakistan furious over such resolution in context to the province of Pakistan. The Prime Minister of Pakistan Yousef Raza Gillani said that this resolution has been considered as attack on the sovereignty of Pakistan and President Obama should avoid this kind of adventure. The issue of Baluchistan is Pakistan’s internal issue and Pakistan has all the ability and capacity to resolve the issue on priority basis. The Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States of America warned the Obama administration that this kind of attitude from the administration of Barrack Obama would badly impact the relations of Pakistan and US. The administration of Barrack Obama after facing severe criticism from the government of Pakistan and its people told that his administration has no policies to provide support to the independence cause of Baluchistan. They added this statement to cover up the situation created after the resolution in the congressional committee. The main reason behind the non-emergence of this resolution till date is purely because of the face saving of the Obama administration from such controversy (Kronstadt, 2012 p. 6).

President Obama Policies on Promotion of Democracy in Pakistan

Pakistan throughout its inception has struggled to implement proper democratic culture in the country. The democratic governments have been overthrown by the military establishment on several occasions. The mandate of the people of Pakistan has been stolen and their decisions to choose their own representatives have been derailed on several moments. The undemocratic culture brings instability within the country as Pitkin says “Democracy is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people” (Pitkin, 2004). President Barrack Obama assumed the office as President of US on that particular time Pakistan moved from dictatorship to democratic form of government under the presidency of Asif Ali Zardari. During that time Pakistan was struggling to implement proper democratic norms in the country after fighting a decade long war on terror the institutions and infrastructure of Pakistan was badly affected. For this purpose, President Obama urged US and international community to strengthen the democratic institutions of Pakistan he considered the promotion of democracy and political stability the way forward for Pakistan to curb internal and external terrorism. Therefore, he stated in his speech:

“America is also providing substantial resources to support Pakistan’s democracy and development. We are the largest international supporter for those Pakistanis displaced by the fighting. And going forward, the Pakistan people must know America will remain a strong supporter of Pakistan’s security and prosperity long after the guns have fallen silent, so that the great potential of its people can be unleashed” (Obama, 2009). The Obama administration stance regarding the promotion of democracy was based on improving the political situation in Pakistan. The consensus of all parties towards the democracy would ply imperative role in the development of the country. The promotion of democracy would automatically help in solving many problems of Pakistan. For the Obama administration after the removal of decade long dictatorial government and restoration of democracy in Pakistan was not mean to be the finish of all problems existing in Pakistan. The dictatorial government has been removed but the real challenge for the democratic government was to improve the fundamental needs of the common peoples (Waseem, 2012).

Furthermore, the Obama administration has provided assistance to Pakistan in strengthening its democracy. The Kerry-Lugar Berman bill which was signed by the Obama administration provided Pakistan 1.5 billion USD assistance for five years on promotion of democracy, development in social sector and economic growth related programs (Ashraf, 2009). The president Obama policy to improve the democratic culture in Pakistan was part of his grand strategy to promote democracy across the globe. The assistance approved in his administration was part of his strategy to create new path ways in Pakistan and US. This strategy would help Pakistan in combating terrorism and protecting the national interests of America in the region. This entire objective could be achieved when Pakistan had well established democratic government to provide viable and feasible assistance to the Obama administration (Iqbal, 2009). President Barrack Obama while meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan Nawaz Sharif told that America and Pakistan considers democracy as the main and strong pillar of Pakistan and US strategic relations. He appreciated the steps taken by the Nawaz Sharif government in strengthening and consolidating the democratic institutions of Pakistan. The strengthening of this institution would help Pakistan to improve its indicators in the global world which will help Pakistan in achieving economic goals. President Barrack Obama and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif during their meeting in 2015 has expressed mutual commitment to further expand the bilateral relations of the both countries, President Obama promised Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif that his administration would provide technical assistance and all sort of support for promotion of democratic principles in Pakistan (Obama, 2016).

Raymond Davis Case and President Obama Administration

Raymond Allen Davis, on January 27, 2011 an American citizen and undercover agent working for the US intelligence killed two young innocent boys in Lahore. Raymond Davis in his statement in front of the Pakistan police stated that he killed both the boys because they were approaching him with looting intentions. In response the authorities in Pakistan categorically said that the two young boys have been killed by Raymond Davis without any reasonable reason. Thus Raymond Davis was arrested and taken into the custody of Pakistan police and he was charged on killing of two innocent civilians of Pakistan. Despite huge pressure of the Obama administration he was not released by the government of Pakistan on strict orders of the court. The controversy of Mr. Raymond Davis case in context to Pakistan forced the Congress of the US by threatening Pakistan that the US would reduce its assistance if the case of Raymond Davis could not be held in satisfactory way (Kronstadt, 2011 p. 8). Same narrative was propagated by President Obama as well he in a statement told about Raymond Davis: "We've got a very simple principle here that every country in the world that is party to the Vienna Convention on diplomatic relations has upheld in the past and should uphold in the future, and that is, if our diplomats are in another country, then they are not subject to that country's local prosecution" (Hassan, 2009)

Furthermore, Raymond Davis was involved in covert operations, the network in which he had close connections and associations were involved in conducting intelligence related activities in Pakistan. The arrest of Raymond Davis was a shock for the administration of Barrack Obama. Despite pressurizing Pakistan on every possible forum the government of Pakistan and the common public were totally against the release of Raymond Davis. The relations of Pakistan and United States of America took new turn due the arrest of Raymond Davis. The contrast opinions inside both countries brought both countries in complex situations. The foreign Minister of Pakistan Shah Mahmood Qureshi has to step up and clear all the situation regarding the release of Raymond Davis he said that the release of Raymond Davis is not possible his case will be dealt with according to the laws in Pakistan further he added that the release of him will be totally against the public opinion which is important stakeholder of the country (Crilly, 2011). The administration of President Obama was quick in responding to the official statement of Pakistan. Therefore, President Obama stated regarding Raymond Davis: "We expect Pakistan, that's a signatory and recognizes Mr. Davis as a diplomat, to abide by the same convention... I'm not going to discuss the specific exchanges that we've had [with the Pakistani government], but we've been very firm about this being a priority" (Tapper & Ferran, 2011). The administration of President Barrack Obama lifted the case by demanding diplomatic immunities for Raymond Davis in accordance with the Vienna Conventions. This was the strategic move of Obama administration policy to protect and rescue the American national regardless of his crime or any other trial according to the law in which he has committed the crime. Moreover, in real essence the exemption in the light of diplomatic immunity was not applicable in Raymond Davis Case. The Obama administration despite knowing the technicalities of the particular case kept on demanding the quick release of Raymond Davis. He has close connections with the famous organization "Black Water" as well. This case has revealed the reality of "Black Water" that many of their operatives are still working on the ground in different territories and cities of Pakistan. It is a notorious mercenary organization whose domain is to eliminate specified targets from the client organization. This case went on to be very serious which almost damaged the relations of Pakistan and United States of America. The civil and military institutions including intelligence agencies of Pakistan were not happy with such acts happening inside Pakistan. They asked the civilian government of Pakistan to convey the message to Obama administration to not conduct such actions in future again (Iqtidar, 2016). Still President Barrack Obama kept on pressing Pakistan to release Raymond Davis he stated: "If our diplomats are in another country, then they are not subject to that country's local prosecution. We respect it with respect to diplomats who

are here. We're going to be continuing to work with the Pakistani government to get this person released we're concerned about the loss of life. We're not callous about that, but there is a broader principle at stake" (Obama, 2011). The constant attention and open statements of the Obama administration forced the government of Pakistan to accept the diplomatic immunity of Raymond Davis. The diplomatic immunity covered him from being further prosecuted in Pakistan. He was set free from the prison and flew back to the United States of America after paying 2.3 million USD to the family of that young boy's as "Diyat" or blood money under the Islamic laws and regulations. The public sentiment aroused against the government of Pakistan they heavily criticized the decision of the government to set a criminal free who has killed two innocent young boys in broad day light. Pakistan considered the covert activities been carried out in its territory as the violation of the sovereignty of Pakistan (Kronstadt, 2012 p. 8).

Operation Neptune Spear and President Obama Policies

The US one-decade long wait was done and dusted when Obama administration launched "Operation Neptune Spear" to kill or capture the head of the Al-Qaeda Osama Bin Laden. On May 2, 2011 this operation was conducted in the city of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa called Abbottabad. This incident has violated the sovereignty of Pakistan and the relations of both countries became very hostile to each other. According to the US media reports on the night of 2 May the Special Forces of the US leading by the Navy SEALs finished 45 minutes long operation in which they claimed that the US Operation Forces after conducting operation killed Osama bin Laden and they have been reached to their bases in Afghanistan harmlessly. Further their media also claimed that the dead body of Osama bin Laden has been buried in the sea. During this whole operation the military leadership was unaware of the US operation which has been conducted in Abbottabad to kill Osama bin Laden (Bowden, 2012). To clarify the position of the United States of America President Obama in his speech to the nation told: "Today, at my direction, the United States launched a targeted operation against that compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan. A small team of Americans carried out the operation with extraordinary courage and capability. No Americans were harmed. They took care to avoid civilian casualties. After a firefight, they killed Osama bin Laden and took custody of his body" (Obama, 2011). The incident of Abbottabad operation created great mistrust and misunderstanding between Pakistan and United States of America. The narrative of the Obama administration regarding Pakistan was that US has been investing in Pakistan for a long decade due to its important position on war against terrorism. The Obama administration were raising serious questions regarding the role of Pakistan they asked on several occasion that why Pakistan has given the refuge to one of the top enemy of the US despite of being in close alliance with the US. The emotions in Pakistan and US were mix after the incident of Abbottabad operation. The people of Pakistan including some portion of the government were of the view that the Obama administration has challenged the sovereignty of Pakistan. They were of the view that the Obama administration should share the intelligence reports with the military establishment of Pakistan and they would launch operation against Osama bin Laden. The foreign interference was hugely criticized in Pakistan. The people back in the US applauded the actions of Obama administration and they fully supported the Obama administration and congratulated him on conducting the successful operation against the top enemy of the US. They considered the death of Osama bin Laden as the finishing point of Al-Qaeda and terrorism (Sanger, 2012). Despite the criticism in Pakistan the statement of Barack Obama regarding the stance of the government of Pakistan clarifies many things. He stated in his book: "I expected my most difficult call to be with Pakistan's beleaguered president, Asif Ali Zardari, who would surely face a backlash at home over our violation of Pakistani sovereignty. When I reached him, however, he expressed congratulations and support. Whatever the fallout, he said, 'it's very good news. He showed genuine emotion, recalling how his wife, Benazir Bhutto, had been killed by extremists with reported ties to al-Qaeda'" (Obama, 2020)

The Obama administration justified the Abbottabad operation on “Liberal Intervention Theory”. His administration did not inform or took any relevant authorities in Pakistan in confidence before conducting the operation which had the potential to disturb the strategic relations of both Pakistan and USA. The Obama administration avoided to inform the authorities of Pakistan it showed the lack of trust for Pakistan under the administration of President Obama. Before this operation his administration and intelligence agencies would inform the authorities of Pakistan before any hot pursuit of conducting drone attacks of FATA territory of Pakistan. Initially, the whole Pakistan and international community was of the view that the operation conducted in Abbottabad was conducted under the supervision of Pakistan civil and military establishments. The constant denial of Civil and military establishment established the fact that the Obama administration act to kill Osama bin Laden was unilateral one. (Islam, 2012). President Obama later on revealed why his administration did not inform Pakistan. He stated:

"The fact that the Abbottabad compound was just a few miles from the Pakistan military's equivalent of West Point only heightened the possibility that anything we told the Pakistanis could end up tipping off our target. Whatever we chose to do in Abbottabad, then, would involve violating the territory of a putative ally in the most egregious way possible, short of war- raising both the diplomatic stakes and the operational complexities" (Obama, 2020). Moreover, President Obama after completing ‘Operation Neptune Spear’ against Osama bin Laden told that it was “the most significant achievement to date in our nation’s effort to defeat Al-Qaeda”. The long decade of US toil to capture or kill Osama bin Laden has ended in shape of Abbottabad operation where America has brought many alterations in their strategic policies (Bentley and Holland, 2013). However, the critics and experts of International Relation were of the view that the Obama administration policies to disturb the sovereignty of Pakistan would end the danger of terrorism and terrorist organizations. They criticized the policies of Obama administration that the support and assistance provided by Pakistan to US and NATO troops in Afghanistan which has produced positive results; these results would not have been possible without the support of Pakistan. Furthermore, they were of the view that Pakistan has shared intelligence related information on each and every aspect with the US in war against terrorism so the Obama administration should also share the intelligence information with Pakistan for this operation (Parmar et al., 2014). Obama stated in his speech: “Over the years, I’ve repeatedly made clear that we would take action within Pakistan if we knew where bin Laden was. That is what we’ve done. But it’s important to note that our counterterrorism cooperation with Pakistan helped lead us to bin Laden and the compound where he was hiding. Indeed, bin Laden had declared war against Pakistan as well, and ordered attacks against the Pakistani people” (Obama, 2011). The killing of Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad operation during the administration of President Obama, his strategic policies for Pakistan produced new twist in the relations of the both countries. The policy of President Obama where he did not inform any military establishment or civil leadership of Pakistan produced negative impacts on the image of Pakistan. The military establishment felt that the policies of Obama administration were the violation of global norms. Pakistan has been treated with utmost disrespect and the image of Pakistan after the incident of Pakistan was emerged as untrusted and vague state. The global world questioned the strategic role, capacity and competence of Pakistan in GWOT after huge investment (Soherwordi, 2010).

References

1. Ackerman, S. (2008). The Obama doctrine', *The American Prospect*. 2008-03-24) [2010-01 08]. <http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles>.
2. Ahmad, I. (2010). The US Af-Pak strategy: challenges and opportunities for Pakistan. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 37(4), 191-209.
3. Ahmed, J., & Hussain, S. (2016). Coverage of Pakistan general election 2008 in leading Pakistan English newspapers: Exploring agenda setting. *Global Media Journal*, 9(2), 1-16.

4. Alam, Q. (2019). The Qisas and Diyat Law in Pakistan: Prosecution of Offence of Murder. *Islamic Studies*, 58(4), 551.
5. Ali, M. (2010). Strategy for Peace: Af-Pak and Beyond. *Pakistan Horizon*, 63(1), 47-61
6. Aqromi, N. L. (2011). The Implicatures Used in the Debate between Barrack Obama and John McCain. *JurnalIlmiahTeknologiInformasi Asia*, 5(2), 36-51.
7. Ashraf, S. (2009). The Kerry-Lugar Bill: Difficult Choices for Pakistan. Institute of South Asian Studies.
8. Bentley, M., & Holland, J. (2013). Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror:
9. Bowden, M. (2012). The finish: The killing of Osama bin Laden. Atlantic Monthly Press.
10. Caldwell, D. (2011). Vortex of conflict: US policy toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq. *Stanford University Press*.
11. Carafano, J. (2010). Explaining the Obama national security strategy. *The Foundry*, 28.
12. Chollet, D., & Fishman, B. (2015). Who Lost Libya. *Foreign Aff.*, 94, 154.
13. Chun, R. S. (2018). Visual rhetoric of the presidency: An analysis of the Trump and Obama White House messaging in their first 100 days in Flickr images. *Journal of Visual Literacy*, 37(1), 18-39.
14. Cordesman, A. H. (2009). The Afghan-Pakistan War: New NATO/ISAF Reporting on Key Trends: CSIS.
15. Crilly, R. (2011). Raymond Davis was "Acting Head of CIA in Pakistan". *The Telegraph*, 22.
16. Deeks, A. S. (2011). Pakistan's Sovereignty and the Killing of Osama Bin Laden. ASIL Insights (5 May 2011) Available at <http://www.asil.org/insights110505.cfm>.
17. DeYoung, K. (2013, June 18). U.S. to launch peace talks with Taliban. National Security. Retrieved March 7, 2022, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-to-relaunch-peace-talks-with-taliban/2013/06/18/bd8c7f38-d81e-11e2-a016-92547bf094cc_story.html
18. Dionne Jr, E. J. (2009). The Obama Doctrine. *The Washington Post*, 16.
19. Dorani, S. (2019). *America in Afghanistan: Foreign Policy and Decision Making from Bush to Obama to Trump*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
20. Dreier, P. (2009). Organizing in the Obama Era: A Progressive Moment or a New Progressive Era?, 42 J. Marshall L. Rev. 685 (2009). *UIC Law Review*, 42(3), 7.
21. Drezner, D. (2009). Explaining the Obama doctrine. *Foreign Policy*, March, 20.
22. Ferguson, N. (2017). The false prophecy of hyperconnection: How to survive the networked age. *Foreign Affairs*, 96(5), 68-79.
23. Fischer, K., & Schultz, U. (2012). The USA and Pakistan-A Volatile Partnership. *Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS)*.
24. Fraser, A. H. (2019). Pakistan and the Taliban. *American Intelligence Journal*, 36(2), 99-107.
25. Friends of Democratic Pakistan Summit Meeting Concluding Statement by the Co-Chairs. (2009, September 4). US Department of State. Retrieved April 3, 2009, from <https://www.scribbr.com/apa-citation-generator/>
26. Goldberg, J. (2018). The obama doctrine. In *The Best American Magazine Writing 2017* (pp. 243-302). *Columbia University Press*.
27. Goodson, L. P. (2008). Pakistan after Musharraf: The 2008 elections. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(4), 5-15.
28. Goswami, N. (2009). The Obama Administration's Afghanistan–Pakistan Policy: In Need of an Urgent *Rethink*.
29. Hassan, A. (2009) "George W. Bush, September 11th and the Rise of the Freedom Agenda in US-Middle East Relations: A Constructivist Institutional Approach", PHD Thesis. Birmingham: *University of Birmingham*

30. Hayes, S. F. (2009). Thoughts on an'Obama Doctrine'. *The Weekly Standard*, December, 10.
31. Hippel, K. V., & Shahid, S. (2009, October 19). The Politics of Aid: Controversy Surrounds the Pakistan Aid Bill. *Center of Strategic and International Studies*. Retrieved March 8, 2022, from <https://www.csis.org/analysis/politics-aid-controversy-surrounds-pakistan-aid-bill>
32. Holbrooke, R. (2009). Coordinated support for Afghanistan and Pakistan. *Hampton Roads International Security Quarterly*, 9, 2829.
33. HouseBrown, S., & Scales, R. H. (Eds.). (2012). *US Policy in Afghanistan and Iraq: Lessons and Legacies (Vol. 1)*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
34. Hussain, D. N., & Farani, M. N. U. D. (2012). The US Exit Strategy: Impact on War on Terror in Afghanistan. *Editorial Board*, 30(3), 22.
35. Iqbal, A. (2009). Obama signs Kerry-Lugar bill into Law. *Dawn, Karachi*, October, 16.
36. Iqtidar, H. (2016). Conspiracy Theory as Political Imaginary: Blackwater in Pakistan. *Political Studies*, 64(1), 200–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248>.
37. Jaffrelot, C. (2016). *Pakistan at the Crossroads: Domestic Dynamics and External Pressures*. Random House India.
38. Kerry, J. (2009, January 23). KERRY: Pakistan needs our support. *The Washington Times*. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/jan/23/pakistan-needs-our-support/>
39. Khan, A. (2009). President Barack Obama's Policy on Afghanistan. *Reflections*, 1.
40. Krasner, S. D. (2012). Talking Tough to Pakistan: How to End Islamabad's Defiance. *Foreign Affairs*, 87-96.
41. Krauthammer, C. (2009, October 26). Obama Is Average. *Spiegel International*. Retrieved March 2, 2022, from <https://www.spiegel.de/international/world/a-656501.html>
- Cox, K. R. (2016). The politics of urban and regional development and the American exception. *Syracuse University Press*.
42. Kronstadt, A. (2012, May 24). Pakistan-U.S. Relations. *Congressional Research Service*.
43. Kulish, N., & Cooper, H. (2009). Holbrooke Says Afghan War 'Tougher Than Iraq'. *The New York Times*, 158(54582), 1-L.
44. Lieven, A. (2012). *Pakistan: A hard country: Public Affairs*.
45. Limbert, J. (2010). The Obama Administration. The Iran primer, Power, politics, and US policy, 146-148.
46. Markey, D. S. (2009). From AfPak to Pak-Af: A response to the new US strategy for south Asia. *Council on Foreign Relations*.
47. McCormick, J. M. (2014). 11 American foreign policy during the Obama administration. *Obama and the World: New Directions in US Foreign Policy*, 133.
48. Mehrish, B. N. (2012). US-Pakistan Relations Under the Obama Administration: Recent Scenario. *IUP Journal of International Relations*, 6(4), 19.
49. Mitchell, L. A. (2011). The Sum of Obama's Foreign Policy Parts.
50. Mohan, R. (2009, March 12). How Obama Can Get South Asia Right. *The Washington Quarterly*, 32:2, 173-189. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01636600902775656>
51. Najam, D. (2020, December 16). Kerry-Lugar Bill and the unravelling of Pak-US ties. *The Express Tribune*. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2276230/kerry-lugar-bill-and-the-unravelling-of-pak-us-ties>
52. Nelson, M. J. (2009). Pakistan in 2008: moving beyond Musharraf. *Asian Survey*, 49(1), 16-27.
53. Obama, B. (2009). Official Remarks of United States President Barack Obama at the Opening Ceremony of the Fifth Summit of the Americas. *Quinta Cumbre de las Américas, Puerto España–Trinidad y Tobago*, 17.

54. Obama, B. (2009, January 1). Remarks by the President in the address to the nation on the way forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan. New York, New York, USA.
55. Obama, B. (2010). National security strategy of the United States (2010). *Diane Publishing*.
56. Obama, B. (2016, December 6). Remarks by the President on the Administration's Approach to Counterterrorism. *The White House*. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/12/06/remarks-president-administrations-approach-counterterrorism>
57. Obama, B. (2016, December 6). Remarks by the President on the Administration's Approach to Counterterrorism. *The White House*. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/12/06/remarks-president-administrations-approach-counterterrorism>
58. Obama, B. (2020). *A Promised Land*. Penguin Books.
59. Packer, G. (2019). Our man: Richard Holbrooke and the end of the American century. *Random*
60. Parmar, I., Miller, L. B., & Ledwidge, M. (2014). Obama and the world: New directions in US foreign policy: *Routledge*
61. Pirzada, D. M. (2011). Nightmare at Salala. Islamabad, Pakistan: *The Express Tribune*.
62. Quinn, A. (2015). Obama's National Security Strategy: Predicting US Policy in the context of changing worldviews.
63. Ra'ees, W. (2010). Obama's Afghanistan strategy: A policy of balancing the reality with the practice. *J. Pol. & L.*, 3, 80
64. Rafique, N. (2011). Analyzing the Kerry-Lugar bill. *Strategic Studies*, 31(1/2), 261-278.
65. Rafique, N. (2011). Analyzing the Kerry-Lugar bill. *Strategic Studies*, 31(1/2), 261-278.
66. Reeves, J., & May, M. S. (2013). The peace rhetoric of a war president: Barack Obama and the just war legacy. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 16(4), 623-650.
67. Rohde, D. (2012). The Obama Doctrine. *Foreign Policy*, (192), 65.
68. Rubin, B. R. (2013). *Afghanistan from the Cold War through the War on Terror*. Oxford University Press.
69. Sanger, D. E. (2012). Confront and conceal: Obama's secret wars and surprising use of American power: *Crown*.
70. Selchow, S. (2017). Resilience and resilient in Obama's National Security Strategy 2010: Enter two 'political keywords'. *Politics*, 37(1), 36-51.
71. Simpson, B. (2012). The United States and the curious history of self determination. *Diplomatic History*, 36(4), 675-694.
72. Soherwardi, S. H. S. (2010). Pakistan's Foreign Policy Interaction with the US Foreign Policy Making Bodies (1947-2010): An Analysis. *IPRI Journal*, 10(2)
73. Stern, J. (2015). Obama and terrorism. *Foreign Aff.*, 94, 62.
74. Subramaniam, P. (2009, November 5). The Kerry-Lugar Bill. Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies. Retrieved March 5, http://www.ipcs.org/comm_select.php?articleNo=2998
75. Sweet, L. (2008). The war over the war. *Chicago Sun-Times*, 16.
76. Tapper, J., & Ferran, L. (2011, January 28). President Barack Obama: Pakistan Should Honor Immunity for 'Our Diplomat'. ABC News. Retrieved March 7, 2022, from <https://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/raymond-davis-case-president-barack-obama-urges-pakistan/story?id=12922282>
77. Tellis, A. (2008). Pakistan and the War on Terror Pakistan and the War on Terror. Wahington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved June 1, 2022, from https://carnegieendowment.org/files/tellis_pakistan_final.pdf
78. Traynor, I. (2009, February 08). Obama team outlines 'new realism' for Afghanistan. *The Guardian*. Retrieved March 6, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/feb/08/obama-afghanistan-us-foreign-policy>

79. Vik, C. (2015). Moral Responsibility, Statecraft, and Humanitarian Intervention: The US Response to Rwanda, Darfur, and Libya. *Routledge*.
80. Walser, R. (2010). Colombia and Obama's Latin American Policy: Time to Close Ranks and Support a Friend. *Backgrounders, The Heritage Foundation*.
81. Waseem, M. (2012). Civil–Military Relations in Pakistan. In Pakistan in regional and global politics (pp. 217-247). *Routledge India*.
82. Wilson, S., Whitlock, C., & Branigin, W. (2011). Osama bin Laden killed in US raid, buried at sea. *Washington Post*, 2.
83. Wing, A. K. (2009). Conceptualizing global substantive justice in the age of Obama. *J. Gender Race & Just.*, 13, 705.