

Richard Záborský
The Bush Administration and Pakistan: Utilitarian Partnership?
M.A. Dissertation Evaluation
2013

Richard Záborský has produced a thought-provoking dissertation on the relationship between the United States and Pakistan during the presidency of George W. Bush. Richard has been under the fine care of Jana Sehnálková, who is always helpful and attentive to the needs of students. Jana's supervision has ensured that the treatise is well structured and nicely written. The referencing is consistent and the bibliography is extensive. Insofar as the structure is concerned, the work contains an Introduction, six main chapters, and a Conclusion.

In the Introduction, Richard spells out clearly that the U.S.-Pakistani relationship has had its ups and downs and he points out that the relationship during the Bush years was rather utilitarian. Pakistan did pursue other objectives despite receiving generous U.S. aid and the United States gained some short term military and strategic advantages in Afghanistan. Richard's evaluation of the sources is excellent as is his decision to tackle the issue of U.S.-Pakistani relations from a realist perspective.

Chapter 1 presents an overview of U.S.-Pakistani relations and how the relationship evolved during the Cold War and post-Cold War periods. Pakistan was logistically crucial for American support for the anti-Soviet campaign in Afghanistan in the 1980s and the Reagan administration generously provided assistance to the country. However, when the Cold War ended, the United States neglected Pakistan and this was at a time when political instability in Pakistan and the region as such was increasing. After 11 September, the United States was forced to alter significantly its national security priorities.

In Chapter 2, Richard assesses the impact of 9/11 on American policy. Indeed, references to morality certainly were convenient for the neoconservative agenda, which set the stage for American attempts to reshape the world, overthrow dictatorships, and deepen alliances. However, Richard is correct that the relationship with Pakistan was ad hoc and based on immediate strategic needs rather than the internationalist morality proclaimed by the Bush administration. Fighting Al Qaeda and getting Osama Bin Laden were the greatest priority and Pakistan was crucial in the U.S. war in Afghanistan.

Chapter 3 discusses the depth of Pakistani security priorities and the fact that Pakistan possesses nuclear weapons. He demonstrates how, prior to 9/11, Pakistan supported one group in Afghanistan whereas India supported another. The complex matter of rivalry with India and Pakistani destabilization efforts in Kashmir also receive attention. Basically, the three main priorities of Pakistani national security policy before 9/11 were maintaining the nuclear deterrent, preventing Kashmir from becoming part of India, and having a pro-Pakistani government in Afghanistan.

The application of coercive diplomacy by the United States in its post-9/11 relations with Pakistan is the subject of Chapter 4. Due to the precarious state of its economy, Pakistan accepted all American demands even though these were not in line with Pakistani national security aims. However, the leader of Pakistan, General Musharraf, managed to convince his colleagues that by siding with the Americans, Pakistan was in a position to strengthen its position vis-à-vis India. After all, according to Musharraf's logic, India might work with the Americans to have Pakistan declared a terrorist state in the event that an arrangement would not be arrived at between Pakistan and the United States.

Chapter 5 scrutinizes in detail American military and economic assistance to Pakistan. Richard's analysis is sound and valid. Though Pakistan's economy was helped by American assistance, there was much waste and the Americans had to compromise their principles by waiving democratic conditions normally attached to economic and military assistance. After all, the democratization of Pakistan was not high on the American list of priorities in the post-9/11 atmosphere. The Americans wanted stability and reliability. Even here, the efforts produced mixed results.

Chapter 6 addresses Pakistan's "independent policy." Though Pakistan did help the Americans in the war on terror, it pursued independent policies on the nuclear deterrent, Kashmir, and in its relations with Afghanistan. Pakistan, unlike the West, differentiated between Jihad and terrorism Pakistani policies towards Afghanistan (double-dealing with militants) reflected this fact, thus putting the Pakistanis and Americans at odds with one another. Pakistan's nuclear dealings also did not go over well in Washington. Nevertheless in 2004 Pakistan became a non-NATO ally of the United States.

In the Conclusion, Richard recapitulates the main points of the six main chapters and states that American efforts in Pakistan and Pakistan's contributions to the war on terror were only partially successful. Richard emphasizes that divergent national security interests were the obstacle to a win-win situation. This is completely accurate.

Richard deserves to be commended on the structure and content of his M.A. dissertation. He obviously devoted much mental and physical energy to the project. However, Richard's utilization of the English language is far from ideal. There are many grammatical errors and he does not use articles (the, a) properly. However, English is not Richard's native language

and the grammatical errors should not be held against him. I recommend an **excellent** mark and

I look forward to his oral defense next week.

.....
Doc. PhDr. Francis D. Raška, PhD.
Department of American Studies
Institute of International Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
Charles University