



Malmö University: Department of Global Political Studies

International Relations III (61-90, 103E)

Supervisor: Erika Svedberg

October 2013

Impact of drone attacks in Pakistan and the war on terror:

A consideration of the effects of drone attacks in Pakistan and whether they are helping or not to win the war on terror!

Abdul-Rehman

19840106-2511

Abstract

This study began with the idea that the drone attacks launched by the United States on the northwest region of Pakistan since 2004 have not helped in the expressed aim of the US to win the war on terror. The study asked three main questions. It wished to discover why drone attacks in Pakistan had not helped to win the war on terror, the main reasons that these attacks have not been successful and how these attacks have led to the increase of the anti-US feeling in Pakistan. The study used a case study methodology that focused on gaining a qualitative insight from a range of perspectives including official government stances, the reaction of media and social media and the public reactions in Pakistan. The study analysis is supported by the theory of neoliberalism and neo realism as it deemed the most appropriate in this type of work.

Conducted within the neoliberal and positivist perspective, the study concluded that the drone strikes have not helped to win the war on terror and that they are actually a major part of why this victory has not yet occurred. The cold-hearted manner with which the US seem to launch drone strike attacks have led to the development of the views that the US does not care for international laws and has no desire to take Pakistan sovereignty into account. The role of the media has helped spread the anti-US feeling far more rapidly than would have been previously possible in the region. The access to the Internet, the use of social media websites and the global coverage of the situation means that reports of civilian casualties has been a common occurrence over the past 10 years, and this has seemingly strengthened the terrorist resolve, turned the public against the US strategy and also led in some cases to the further radicalization of the Pakistani youth. When assessed through a neoliberal perspective, it was apparent that the strategy does not fit with the concept of international co-operation and that the actions of the US have led to the growth of anti-US sentiment. The main failing of the drone strike strategy could be said to be the fact that it was devised using a neorealist attitude in an increasingly neoliberal global society. The study also presented a number of policy recommendations and future areas of study based on the findings from this work.

Word count: 15923

Abbreviations

CIA – Central Intelligence Agency

FATA - Federally Administered Tribal Areas

JeM – Jaish-e-Mohammed

LeT – Lashkar-e-Taiba

NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization

TTP - Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan

UN – United Nations

US – United States

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS	I
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 OVERVIEW	1
1.2 MAIN CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY	1
1.3 BACKGROUND	2
1.3.1 DRONE WARFARE	2
1.4 AIM OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTION	4
1.5 LIMITATIONS	6
2. METHODOLOGY	8
2.1 POSITIVIST PARADIGM	8
2.2 CASE STUDY	9
2.3 RESEARCH DESIGN	11
2.4 SECONDARY SOURCE ANALYSIS	12
3. THEORY	13
3.1 NEOREALISM	13
3.2 NEOLIBERALISM	15
4. ANALYSIS	18
4.1 OVERVIEW	18
4.2 A MILITARY PERSPECTIVE	19
4.3 PAKISTAN'S RESPONSE TO DRONE ATTACKS	21
4.4 SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES CONCERNING DRONE ATTACKS	24
4.5 INFLUENCE OF MEDIA (INCLUDING SOCIAL MEDIA)	27
4.6 ANALYSIS CONCLUSION	29
5. CONCLUSION	32
5.1 MAIN CONCLUSION	32
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	36

A consideration of the impact of drone attacks in Pakistan:

Whether they are helping or not to win the war on terror!

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

The United States government, within the context of its war on terror mantra that has existed ever since the events of 9/11, has launched hundreds of drone attacks on Pakistan during the past decade. These attacks are a common occurrence and generally tend to target areas in the northwest of Pakistan, in territory controlled by tribes such as the Taliban. (Mohanty, 2013) The use of these drone attacks is seen as a potential weapon by the United States against the war on terror but there is also strong opposition to the use of drones in Pakistan, with opponent claiming that they are indiscriminate in their targeting and often kill civilians. (Anwar & Baig, 2012) Therefore, it is apparent that there is an important debate that involves not only the United States and Pakistan but also the global community on the effectiveness of the drone attacks. This debate can be looked at in a number of different ways, with different perspectives highlighting a variety of outcomes for the practice of drone attacks. This study aims to take a detailed and enhanced look at this tactic as used by the United States government and considers the impact of the drone attacks and why they are not helping to win the war on terror.

This introductory chapter aims to present a brief discussion of the background of this drone warfare, with a consideration of the region under attack, the nature of drones and their impact and a brief history of the United States' use of drones against Pakistan since 2004. Due to the complex nature of this study, particularly because of the need to incorporate a range of perspectives in the analysis including that of military, social and political perspectives on a global scale, the study has attempted to create a relatively simple structure to show the impacts of the attacks in northern tribal area of Pakistan.

1.2 Main concepts of the study

The government of Pakistan has condemned publically the drone attacks many times. The opposition in Pakistan also protests against drone attacks strongly. Drones are not only criticized in Pakistan but also criticized in the US by its own citizens and human rights institutions. Pakistan also asked US to give the drone control to his own army so they can

attack the militants themselves and that this could be a more effective resolution to the conflict. (Murphy, 2012) Pakistan has tried to have negotiations about drone attacks on many political levels but it seems like that negotiations are still not fruitful and it is possible that Pakistan has to tell its opinion more strongly and firmly. Civilian casualties are increasing with every attack and it is putting the reputation of the United States at stake within the international arena and particularly in the Muslim world also. The United States has to possibly rethink its policy about drone attacks because these kinds of attacks are not helping the US to win the war against terrorism. These are the theories that have been made concerning the situation so far and it is the aim of this study to assess how far these theories are correct and what the main reasons are for the lack of success using the attacks.

1.3 Background

The United States launched the war on terror following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 that devastated New York and rocked the most powerful nation in the world. The literature notes that shortly after the events in 2001 President George Bush ‘introduced the phrase a “War on Terror”, which soon became the main label of the post-9/11 period’. (Janz, 2010, p.27) Moreover, Bush was quoted as saying that ‘our war on terror begins with al Qaeda but it does not end there. It will not stop until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated’. (Janz, 2010, p.27) This quotation by Bush in a speech in September 2001 opened the way for the United States to launch attacks not only on Afghanistan but on Iraq as well. The attack on Afghanistan has now spread to the northwest region of Pakistan and this is the major focus of this work.

1.3.1 Drone Warfare

It is important to know that why the United States has initiated this plan and the impact that it has had on Pakistani society. The use of drone attacks is reported in the global media on a weekly basis and has been a constant since 2004. One thing is common in these reports and this is that most of the drone attacks occur in Pakistan’s northwest region. (Ahmed, 2013) This area is on the border of the Afghanistan. We have to remember that it is a tribal area, which is controlled by Pakistan’s federal government by political agents. It is called FATA. (Federally Administered Tribal Areas) The main targeted area is most often is Waziristan. (Gunaratna & Iqbal, 2012) This region consists of land on the border of the Pakistan and Afghanistan. This is one of the most difficult borders to control because there

are mountains and there are no clear roads. Therefore the chance that militant groups can cross the border easily is increased dramatically in this region.

Drones are actually man-less small planes which can spy with their high range cameras and infrared rays. It can carry missiles as well and can attack a target. People sitting in America in the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters and other locations in the United States control drones. (Benjamin, 2013) There are many problems associated with drone attacks. The first one is that the United States is attacking a country that they are not actively engaged in a state of war with and it also a direct attack on Pakistan's sovereignty. Secondly, it is causing collateral damage on a larger scale. To kill one or two terrorists, the United States is possibly killing ten or more civilians including children, women and senior citizens, although these figures are hard to justify and are argued on both sides of the debate. (Rashid, 2012) There is also the debate of whether the attacks are being moral or immoral but at the same time it is also increasing the hate inside the country of Pakistan towards the United States, with this feeling intensified in the northwest region. The attacks began in 2004 by American President George W. Bush and then President Barak Obama after him. The change of President did not lead to a reduction in attacks but a slight rise in the number of the strikes. (McGrath, 2011) This has led to the reprisal of the view that it has been a Republican-waged strategy in Pakistan.

The drone attacks, as highlighted earlier, began in 2004. There have been a variety of studies that have been conducted into the area of the strategy of drone attacks and the findings have seemingly found that the strategy has not been efficient in its main aim of targeting terrorists. A recent study by Gram has argued that in an area where the U.S. should try to win the support of people whom live there so they can be free from Taliban's influence and do not support terrorist organizations, "but drones are traumatizing and alienating Pakistanis". (Gram 2012, p.1) The opinion of Gram was developed through the intensive study conducted jointly by the Stanford Law School. (International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic) and the NYU School of Law. (Global Justice Clinic). (2012) This study forms a major part of the analysis for this current work, due to the completion of intensive research that included 'two investigations in Pakistan, more than 130 interviews with victims, witnesses, and experts, and review of thousands of pages of documentation and media reporting'. (Gram 2012, web) It is very important for US to secure itself from the great threat of terrorism, and US also should consider the harm brought by terrorism in Pakistan. On the other hand policies to fight against terrorists should be re-evaluate because they are not helping to reduce terrorism, target killing

and suicide bombing in Pakistan. These findings indicate that the strategy of drone warfare has been one that has attracted criticism in a steady manner since its inception in 2004 and this only seems to be growing stronger as the years pass by.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that the use of drone warfare seems to be continuing unabated by the US government, despite the development of research studies and reports that have advised against this decision. A recent study by Benjamin released this year has supported the findings from earlier that the attacks have become far more frequent under Obama's Presidency. It is acknowledged in the study that 'when George Bush was president, the US carried out forty-five to fifty-two drone strikes in Pakistan; President Obama carried out six times that number in his first term alone'. (Benjamin, 2013, p.134) The impact from a drone strike is incredible and can cause great damage and destruction, as well as killing in an indiscriminate manner. The work by Benjamin acknowledges that 'the missile can instantly incinerate their victims, or kill them with flying shrapnel or powerful blast waves capable of crushing internal organs. Survivors often suffer painful wounds and disfiguring burns, limb amputations, vision loss and hearing loss...survivors can face a lifetime of misery and pain'. (Benjamin, 2013, p.135) This description of the impact of drones highlights how negative a drone strike can be in a populated area and how it is not always possible to target solely terrorists, with the view by Gram that only 1 in 49 individuals hit by drones and killed are terrorists, with the rest being Pakistani civilians. (Gram, 2012, p.1)

1.4 Aim of the study and research question

The Aim of this work is to highlight the situation in Pakistan and how the use of drones as a military strategy by the United States has failed to help win the war on terror. Moreover, there are specific reasons for this failure and these are assessed during this work. These reasons include the growth of anti-US sentiment, both at home and abroad within the international community. The work also aims to include a selection of different perspectives, aiming to underline the growing importance of social media in shaping individual viewpoints in society. A further purpose of this work is also to highlight that the United States government needs to adopt a policy that does not antagonize the population that it is apparently trying to help, as well as emphasize that military force is not always the way to increase security in this modern society.

There are a number of reasons, questions and aims involved in this study. The literature underscores that there is a high level of importance assigned to the design of

research questions with the belief that they need to be able to develop the main area of research under study but also that they need to be achievable within the limitations known only to the researchers involved in the project. (Stake, 1995 p.17) When bearing this in mind, it was decided that the research aims should revolve around a case study analysis of qualitative and secondary source information, mainly because of the lack of resources (time, personnel and financial) that were available for this work. Therefore, the research questions below have been created carefully in terms of discovering why the drone strikes have failed to win the war on terror. The main aim of the research study was to discover the impact of these drone attacks. The question for this study is:

How come drone strikes are an effective strategy or not when looked at within the main context of the war on terror?

The completion of these aims is guided by research objectives that have been created to help keep the main focus in sight at all times. This type of subject, complex in its nature and with many viewpoints to consider, is a perfect chance to become sidetracked and fail to answer effectively the main research questions in the study. Therefore, research objectives have been created to help ensure that the researcher remains on task constantly throughout this thesis. The research objectives include:

- i) Conducting a thorough analysis of the literature on the situation in Pakistan and how the drone attacks have been perceived by different groups in society
- ii) Choosing an appropriate methodology that takes into account the limitations of the study
- iii) Working within an international relations theory to help place the study into a wider theoretical context
- iv) Selecting objective sources, official documents and academic works that are unbiased, or where this is not possible, explaining the bias of works used in the study.

With the use of these objectives constantly referred to, it is believed that this study can be successful and the situation involving the drone strikes in Pakistan over the past decade can be effectively analyzed in an enhanced manner, furthering the knowledge on the subject and leading towards recommendations for future foreign policy by the US and its use of drone strikes as a potential strategy to defeat terrorism.

1.5 Limitations

It is important to consider the limitations of the case study methodology and of this study in general, as well as outlining the advantages of this specific research approach. First, it is important to note that the existence of limitations within any research study is not uncommon and that every study completed is prone to limitations of some kind. These are not negative limitations but merely those that outline the maximum potential reach of an individual study. (Yin, 2009) It is up to the researcher to realize the limitations of the study and to not attempt to achieve results or answer questions that are outside of this reach. Therefore, the reliance on secondary source information in this current study is a possible limitation, particularly because of the fact that each source is likely to have been written with a specific purpose. This does not make the source unusable but does ensure that the researcher needs to be careful in the analysis.

There are a number of problems associated with this type of study and is why there has not yet been a comprehensive study encompassing all of the perspectives targeted in this work, even though the drone attacks have been occurring for almost a decade. The lack of literature on this subject could possibly be put down to the fact that the access to the northwest region is difficult, particularly for foreign outsiders wishing to gain information about the impact of the drone attacks in the region. The fragile stability of the region has been rocked by the use of drone attacks that have killed tribal members from a range of tribes in the area, including possible terrorists and innocent civilians alike. In western society, the premise is that the drone attacks are helping the US to win the war on terror and to argue against this could be seen as being soft on terrorists and terrorism, a label that has threatened the careers of many aspiring politicians. In this manner, it is apparent that the subject is a complex one and also one that does not offer a high level of easy access to individuals willing to speak out about the situation.

Despite this however, the argument made and the assumption taken that the drone attacks are hindering the war on terror are sensible points that require further analysis. Because of this belief, this work aims to focus on the way that both sides, stressing the public image as well as the strategic and military perspective in both the United States and Pakistan, have received the drone attacks. It is not expected that this study will change minds concerning the drone strategy by itself but it is thought that the increase in awareness of the situation and the potential growth in studies spurred on by this one could help to have a positive impact on the relationship between Pakistan and the United States and could also

help to reduce the number of innocent lives lost through these drone strikes and the negative publicity and anti-American sentiment that has arisen in the country because of them.

There are further limitations associated with the work. The use of the mixed methodology approach has been championed due to the fact that it can reduce the limitations in any given research study. However, the literature on research studies within the subjects of political science and international relations stresses that limitations are common and it is important for the researcher to 'note the limitations of the research design selected, including the scope of the subject, the overall design and the methodology'. (McNabb, 2004, p.64) Moreover, the work of McNabb also highlights key mistakes that are often made by research studies those present limitations, which do not need to be there necessarily. These mistakes include the 'failure to develop a coherent and persuasive argument during the research, a failure to cite landmark research on the topic and the failure to delimit the boundary conditions for your research'. (McNabb, 2004, p.64) This current study is one such subject that could suffer greatly if the researcher is unable to limit the boundaries of the research.

The work has already highlighted that it intends to conduct a secondary source case study analysis on the subject and this is an important limitation as the study is not able to conduct primary research into the topic. However, this should not limit the development of the study, unless it focuses more on one particular strand of the analysis. The aim to complete an analysis using political, social and military perspectives as well as the view of the media indicate that there is a wide scope for this study and so the researcher needs to ensure that all areas are covered adequately and in detail, otherwise the validity and reliability of the work could be called into question.

The final limitation of the work is the inability to question, in person, military personnel from the US military as well as individuals in the Pakistani government to see how the military objectives of the US have fared when compared with the development of public reaction and attitude on the ground. These areas of study can be covered through the secondary source analysis but it would perhaps heighten the validity of the results if official replies were received. This though is a possible area of future analysis and therefore the results from this study should be used to help inform further study into the research subject in studies that are directly resourced than this current one. Although there are a number of limitations associated with the work, it is still believed that the analysis can provide insightful and new information on the subject, especially as the drone attacks in Pakistan are still a

relatively recent activity and the literature is lacking slightly in this subject because of the lack of time that has passed since 2004.

2. Methodology

The choice of the methodological approach in any given study is vital; with the correct selection enabling the researcher to develop the findings and to conclude accordingly, meeting the aims of the study. In a complex study such as this one, the selection of the methodology is critical because of the realization of limitations that impose on the work. This chapter discusses the choices in terms of the methodological approach selected, the limitations that impose on the work and the possible limitations that will arise because of the choices made at this juncture. The chapter also underlines the research paradigm with which this study is underpinned by the theoretical background of this work within the international relations sphere.

2.1 Positivist paradigm

The research paradigm selection was a fundamental part of the decision-making process for this methodology. The literature notes that it is “important to make explicit the scientific paradigm in any research study... a paradigm is used to define the legitimate problems and methods of a research field for those practitioners engaged in it”. (Haimés & Steuer, 2000, p.248) Moreover, the concept of the research paradigm is “connected with the set of beliefs, procedures and working practices that inform the dominant world view and which shapes the context of modern social science. A paradigm is nothing more or less than a conceptual framework for research”. (Somekh & Lewin, 2005, p.207) The research paradigm provides a type of guidance for the researcher and the decision is key in shaping the rest of the project.

This study has already highlighted the assumptions that have been made on the topic of drone warfare in Pakistan. The work has assessed that there is a counter-productivity of drone attacks and that they are generally unhelpful to the US ability to win the war on terror. The reasons for this failure are blurred at this time but are potentially due to the immoral nature of the use of drones, the growth of anti-US sentiment due to the bombing and the killing of innocent civilians. While these factors are debated as to their relative importance in the prevention of the United States’ victory in the war on terror, it is not disputed that the use

of drone attacks has held back this aim. Using this type of absolute truth to underpin a project enables the researcher to introduce the positivist paradigm.

Positivism and the positivist paradigm is defined as a philosophy with the ‘empiricist view that knowledge stems from human experience...individual cases are subsumed within hypotheses about general laws of nature, and there is an assumption that human beings and human societies are subject to laws in the same way that the natural world is’. (Collins, 2010, p.38) Moreover, the work by Collins announces that positivism is a paradigm in which ‘only empirically verifiable ideas essentially count as knowledge or truth...it authorizes recommendations for social reform on the basis of truth claims and certainty’. (Collins, 2010, p.38) With this viewpoint in mind, the use of the positivist paradigm suits this study well. The earlier theories made about drone attacks, with the belief that they cannot help the US win the war on terror because it is a form of terror in itself, underline a certain truth held in society about the activity of man. Using this as the truth, the paradigm can then be used to help distinguish the reasons why this truth exists.

2.2 Case study

Within the paradigm of positivism, the major methodological approach has been selected for this case study analysis. Case study is important in this research because there was no direct access to victims of drone attacks and officials in US and Pakistan to collect data via interviews and officials documents of military and governments of both countries. “Case studies allow a researcher to achieve high levels of conceptual validity, or to identify and measures the indicators that represent the theoretical concepts the researcher intends to measure”. (George and Bennett 2005, p.19) The introduction of the case study analysis methodology has been selected because of the limitations that were imposed on this study before the research even began. The lack of financial resources, personnel and time meant that it was not possible to travel to Pakistan or to interview individuals with knowledge of the situation. Therefore, in attempting to gain as wide a research scope as possible, it was deemed important to use a methodological approach that enabled a range of analytical methods to be employed. The case study methodology is one such approach and its advantages far outweigh its disadvantages, as noted in this section.

The use of the case study method lends itself well to the topic at hand. The analysis of drone strikes on Pakistan and how it has impacted the attitude held towards the US by the Pakistani public, the global population in a wider sense as well as the influence it has had on

government diplomacy. The literature has analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of case study methodology in a detailed manner, mainly because it has become a popular methodology in recent years. (Yin 2009, p. 13) It is underlined by one scholar that there are chief advantages of the method and these include the fact that case study methodology is intensive in its nature. It takes up the study of a unit in its entirety. As such, it leaves greater scope for an in-depth study or a particular problem...and is a description of a real event or situation, unlike other studies, which may involve abstraction from real situations and based purely on theory. (Mustafa 2008, p.17) With this view in mind, it is clear that the analysis of the drone strikes on Pakistan will benefit greatly from the application of case study methodology, allowing the researcher to gain an in-depth evaluation of a range of perspectives on the topic. This should enable the researcher to find out the most important reasons as to why the use of the drone strike attacks on northwest Pakistan have led to the growing inability of the US to win the war on terror in the region.

Further research on case study methodology indicates that there are other factors involved that make the use of case study an effective form of approach for a research study within the social science field. George and Bennett underlines that ‘one of the main advantages of case studies is their ability to serve the heuristic purpose of inductively identifying additional variables and generating hypotheses...moreover, case studies can analyze qualitatively complex events and take into account numerous variables precisely because they do not require numerous cases or a restricted number of variables’. (George & Bennett 2005, p.45) This view is important because of the complexity associated with this current study and the need to consider the topic from a range of perspectives, each with different belief systems in terms of the possible effectiveness of the use of drone warfare. The lack of limitations placed on a case study analysis means that this method is ideal in attempting to analyze the topic in this work.

Another advantage of the case study methodology is the ability to use a range of informative sources and types of data, rather than simply focusing on a purely quantitative or qualitative method. This style of research, known as the mixed methods research has been championed in recent years in the field of social science because of the fact that the combination of two different types of methodological approach helps to reduce the limitations that are associated with single research methodology. (Creswell & Clark, 2010) Furthermore, the case study method is able to use these types of research approach in a manner that allows

a study of an exploratory nature, helping to focus on a range of different perspectives that might not always be included otherwise.

The literature on political science research identifies that both quantitative and qualitative methods can be used in the same study, thereby making the old argument that one or the other had to be picked, redundant. A work by Halperin and Heath note that ‘quantitative and qualitative research are substantively the same and only differ in the types of techniques they employ; that the differences between the quantitative and qualitative traditions are only stylistic and are methodologically and substantively unimportant’. (Halperin & Heath 2012, p.7) Through this belief, the choices made in this case study design are supported by the literature and this enables the researcher to undertake the research task with the view that the methodology chosen is appropriate and able to achieve success in this research context.

2.3 Research design

Having underlined the justification for the study to use a case study methodology underpinned by a positivist paradigm, the actual research design needs to be presented. The reliance on secondary source information has meant that this study is one that conducts a case study research assessment using a number of perspectives on the subject. The research intends to study the subject from military, political and social perspectives, outlining key reasons as to why the drone attacks have failed to win the war on terror in the region from these different viewpoints. To achieve this, the study intends to evaluate and synthesize secondary resources and data from a plethora of official sources that highlight the impact of the drone attacks. These include information regarding Pakistan’s official policy about drone attacks, Pakistan’s politics and drone attacks, the public reaction to the drone strikes, the media reaction in Pakistan and the United States, the views portrayed on social media sites regarding the subject and the development of problems regarding sovereignty because of the drone strike attacks in northwest Pakistan. The coverage of these perspectives should enable the case study to conduct a detailed and insightful critical evaluation of the situation, as is the remit of case study methodology.

The study will use information taken from government documents, official sources relating to the subject, media reports and work from respected academic scholars on the topic. When dealing with these different types of data, it is important that the researcher is aware of the possibility of subjective accounts and bias. (Creswell, 2009) Each source needs

to be analyzed to decipher whether there is bias or a subjective viewpoint behind the literature. (Most likely there will be) This does not make each source invalid but it is important to make sure that the researcher makes the reader aware of this potential bias so the analysis can be given greater validity and reliability when assessed by the wider research field.

2.4 Secondary Source Analysis

Within the case study methodology, it was also necessary to find an approach to the analysis that could be used within the range of perspectives that were needed for this work. The approach selected was that of the secondary source analysis), an approach that can help to explain complex and global situations in a manner that does not limit the study in terms of its lack of primary source analysis. The use of secondary source analysis has been viewed as an effective way of assessing a situation such as the drone strike strategy and its impact on Pakistan. Rather than be limited by the ability to only collect primary data from specific sources, or sources that are unofficial, it is assessed that the use of secondary source case study analysis can allow the researcher to be far more selective in terms of the quality of the data used, choosing official sources and those that can enhance the knowledge of the debate rather than rely on primary sources that might not develop the discussion further (Kahl, 2008).

This view is supported by Fairclough (2003) who identifies that the analysis of secondary sources can help assess and evaluate relationships between cultures and different societies, particularly with the important growth of media access in modern society and the growth of availability of sources that reflect many sides of one specific debate. We currently live in an information age, it has become far more important to assess how society reacts to certain events, inviting this type of study for the situation involving drone attacks in Pakistan since 2004. There is a possible limitation associated with secondary source analysis. It has been noted by Klotz and Lynch (2007) that ‘studies that rely heavily on secondary sources risk the selection of only those texts that confirm a particular historical reading’ (p.30). Due to this concern, great care has been taken by the researcher to select texts that both consider the effectiveness of the US drone strategy and the ineffectiveness of the same strategy. This is why analysis of the US military perspective has been included as well as that of the Pakistani government, global media and Pakistani population to ensure a fair assessment of the available information regarding the use of drone strikes as a strategy in the war against terror.

3. Theory

Prior to presenting an analysis of the nature of the drone attacks in Pakistan, it is important to place the analysis within a theoretical context. The research has used a case study approach to the work, to fully assess the situation from different perspectives. The case study method was the most appropriate due to the fact that it does allow the researcher to use a variety of approaches within the overall course of the case study. Furthermore, the case study enquiry was underpinned by a positivist research paradigm, mainly because of the complexity of this subject and that view that the topic creates extremely subjective viewpoints depending upon the stance of the individual.

Two IR theories have been selected in the theoretical context, and a discussion between these two theories will be provided here. First of all it is prudent to provide brief definitions of the two theories compared for the purposes of this work. Therefore, this section presents a concise introduction of the two theories, neo-realism and neo-liberalism. The similarities and differences of the two theories are discussed in this section although it is important to acknowledge that these theories are limited in their use because they are non-fluid, whereas real-life political situations are complex and fluid in their nature, such as that in Pakistan where the use of drone attacks has been impacting upon the attitude towards the United States in the region.

One of the major current debates within international relations tends to cover the concepts of neoliberalism versus that of neorealism. A study by Sutch and Elias notes that ‘the neo-realism versus neo-liberalism debate has dominated mainstream international relations theory since the 1980s’. (Sutch & Elias 2007, p.11) However, it is also clear that the two theoretical concepts share many elements in common. Moreover, the paper by Sutch and Elias discusses the belief that ‘some scholars have gone as far as to suggest that the fact the neo-realism and neo-liberalism share the scientific, methodological and epistemological approach to international relations means that this debate is not really a debate as such, or at the very best is an intra-paradigm rather than an inter-paradigm debate’. (2007 p.11) With this in mind, this current study aims to highlight the major similarities between the two theoretical concepts as well as identifying the main differences as well as underlining why the theory of neoliberalism was used to underpin the current work.

3.1 Neorealism

First, it is important to analyze the concept of neo-realism. It is argued by Weber that the neo-realists believe that the world revolves around an anarchic system in which the nation

state is the central component. Within this, the ‘overriding goal of states in this environment of international anarchy is to survive’. (Weber 2009 p. 16) It is also thought that neo-realists agree that there ‘is no way out of international anarchy. It is unrealistic to think that a world government could be formed because states would never be secure enough, and therefore trusting enough, to give up their power to a world government’. (Weber, 2009 p. 16) In this manner, the theory of *neo-realism* argues that international politics is governed by the nation state and its self-interest, with an increase in power the only viable form of achieving survival because of a lack of confidence in a potential world government.

This theory therefore subscribes to the view that armed conflict is inevitable due to the need of nation states to increase power and therefore war is a key effect of the international process. (Jackson & Sorensen, 2007) The review of the concept of neo-realism would seem to suggest that that the United States is correct in applying its drone strike strategy in northern Pakistan. If the goal of the nation state is survival in an anarchic global society, it is apparent that the state must be able to use whatever strategy is available to them to achieve this. Within this view, the actions of the United States are justified because of the need to ensure security and the reduction of a threat from terrorists in the region and in Afghanistan.

To this end, the views of the scholars such as Weber indicate that the concept of neorealism is an appropriate theory to immerse international relations analysis in, because of the realistic view that the main goal of nation states is to survive in a world of constant anarchy. Through this, Weber highlights that ‘the only way that states can reasonably ensure their survival is to increase their power. Power protects states because states with less power might fear those with more power and therefore be less likely to attack them’. (Weber 2009, p.16) Although this theory has a great many supporters within the overall field of political science, it should also be stressed that this theory has become undermined by the actions of terrorist groups that do not conform to the traditional theory of realism or neorealism.

The actions of terrorists in modern society have been to strike at the heart of the most powerful nations, regardless of the consequences to themselves in the long run. This has made it increasingly difficult for states to consider their actions through the theory of neorealism because it would appear that these terrorist organizations are not afraid of power. Therefore, the use of drone strikes in Pakistan does not impact on the terrorist organizations in a negative manner because they do not control the state and so do not have the traditional worries and burdens of needing to appease the public.

It is felt that this neorealist theory is far too simplistic and naive in the situation considering drone attacks in Pakistan. The terrorist organizations are not a nation state and so do not conform to traditional IR theory. Moreover, the terrorist organizations are not necessarily worried about security, as their main aim is to make a statement against certain targets in global society. This is why the use of a neorealist framework for this study would be unsuccessful and would simply highlight that the US has used a strategy that makes sense in a neorealist manner, but does not help to explain why there are serious failings and flaws with this particular drone strategy. Therefore, it is important to consider the nature of the neoliberal theory within an international relations context.

3.2 Neoliberalism

In contrast to this view of the self-interest, focus on survival and distrust of an international system that is neorealism, the theory of *neo-liberalism* helps to explain the need for effective collaboration and the reduction of the use of violence in global society. It is thought that neo-liberals, to some degree still view the world as an international anarchical system but it has been described as ‘a theoretical approach to international relations that draws upon concepts of rationality and contracting, and focuses attention upon the central role of institutions and organizations in international politics. The international political and economic environment is highly institutionalized and international institutions play an important role in the international distribution of wealth and power’. (Dunne, Kurki & Smith, 2007 p. 110) Moreover, neo-liberalists have argued that neo-realists have ‘underestimated the importance of transnational relations’. (Sutch & Elias, 2007 p. 11) It has been acknowledged that neo-liberalism developed because the theory of realism failed to explain the peaceful break-up of the USSR back in the 1990s and the development of modern international society since then.

The concept of *neo-liberalism* is based on the belief that ‘progress in international relations can be achieved only through international co-operation and that international institutions can help countries resolve their differences peacefully’. (Duncan, Jancar-Webster & Switky, 2008 p. 49) They define *neo-liberalism* as ‘a philosophical position that argues that progress in international relations can be achieved only through international co-operations.’ Co-operation is a dynamic rather than static process. By focusing on understanding the dynamics of the web of relationships driving the international system, states and other

international actors can use the international institutions spawned by the system to promote peace and co-operation. The use of co-operation in a global manner and the general thoughts of the neoliberal camp towards international relations help to identify this theory as the most appropriate for this type of study.

The theory introduced in the introductory chapter of this work highlights that the use of the neoliberal approach is the most sensible for this work. This basic theory of the research include the fact that civilian casualties are increasing with every attack and this is placing the reputation of the United States at stake within the international arena and particularly the Muslim world as well. Due to this, the United States has to rethink its policy about drone attacks because these kinds of attacks are not helping the US to win the war against terrorism. The rejection of this drone strategy (an outright military attack on another nation state) therefore rejects the overall concept of neorealism because it highlights that the use of military force has failed to secure the stability that the United States had hoped for when it launched the strategy in 2004. In this manner, it is more appropriate to assess the situation using the neoliberalism theory that focuses mainly on tenets of international cooperation, aiming to see the social impact of the US military strike and providing reasons as to why this has been a failure.

3.3 Similarities and differences

There are certain similarities and differences between the two theories. When conducting a brief comparison into the two theories, it is important to assess these and highlight how they accept certain truths in global society. It is clear that although both theories are based on the theory that the international system is one founded on anarchy. The two theories identify different ways in which this has been used to predict how individual states would react. This has led to fundamental differences in the two theories regarding their opinions on the possible success of international institutions and the co-operation of nation states in achieving a shared goal. Baldwin who noted that ‘although the two theories do not deny that the international system is anarchical in some sense, there is disagreement as to what this means and why it matters’ underlines this. (Baldwin, 1993 p. 4) Through this work, it is thought that the consideration of the possible success of international institutions in preventing armed conflict will highlight the different attitudes of these two theories and stress why they differ in their intrinsic beliefs.

The biggest difference between the two theories is perhaps the attitude concerning gain and whether this gain is relative or absolute. The United States war on terror was started officially because of the need to get rid the world of terrorist organizations. Although the US clearly wanted to ensure the safety for itself, but it would not have been able to launch attacks in Iraq without the support of allies such as the United Kingdom and therefore the proviso for the war on terror was the need to secure an absolute gain for the state and if this leads to a gain for the entire global society, then so be it. This use of the theory of absolute gain sits far better with the theory of neoliberalism, as neorealist thought tends to reflect the belief that nation states wish to secure relative gain. It is stated by Baldwin that ‘neoliberalism assumes that states focus primarily on their absolute gain and whether co-operation results in a relative gain or loss is not very important...in contrast, neorealism assumes that states are largely concerned with relative rather than absolute gains’. (1993, p.209) Therefore, although both theories assume that the global situation is one of anarchy, the concept of neoliberalism suits the needs of this study better and has been selected as the theory to underpin the work.

Finally, it is also vital to stress that the completion of an analysis within a neoliberal or a neorealist paradigm has its limitations. The literature acknowledges that ‘many historians and students of international politics have been skeptical about the possibility of creating a theory that might help one to understand and explain the international events that interest them’. (Rotberg, Rabb & Gilpin 1989, p.39) This study further accepts that theory ‘cannot explain the accidental or account for unexpected events; it deals in regularities and repetitions and is possible only if these can be identified’. (Rotberg, Rabb & Gilpin 1989, p.39-40) Within this view, there are clear limitations of using a theory to help discuss and analyze a topic within the sphere of international relations but the use of theory can help to shed new light on a topic and help to explain some of the certain fundamental factors involved in the situation. Thus, it is hoped that the analysis of the situation-involving drone attacks and its impact on the war on terror will help to bring new information to the discussion in terms of knowledge on why the drone attacks have not worked. Although it is accepted that the use of the neoliberalism theory does have its limitations, it is thought that this is the most appropriate theory in which to base this analysis and is why the choice has been made in this manner

4. Analysis

4.1 Overview

The analysis of the situation in Pakistan, with the use of drone attacks by the US as possibly a reason why the US has failed to win the war on terror, must be underlined by the theoretical discussion that took place in the previous chapter. To discover the reasons why the drone attacks have not helped lead to victory in the war on terror, the extent to which the attacks have increased anti-US feeling in Pakistan and the overall view of whether drone strikes can be seen as an effective strategy, this work has stated that it provides the evaluation within the concept of the neoliberalism theory, aiming to find an absolute truth set in the positivist paradigm. The case study analysis offered a predominantly secondary-source based assessment of the situation in Pakistan and this was justified because of the enormity of the subject and the need to provide assessment from both sides of the debate, a concept beyond the resources of the researcher. The use of secondary source analysis is viewed as an effective way of assessing a situation such as the drone strike strategy and its impact on Pakistan and this is why it has been chosen as the major methodological approach for this current study.

After highlighting the underlying theory of neoliberalism used in this study, it is necessary to conduct the analysis of the situation in Pakistan. The main aim of this study is to consider the use of drone warfare in northwestern Pakistan and how the strategy has not managed to help the United States win the war on terror. This chapter focuses on the subject from different perspectives, identifying the impact of the drone strikes from military, political and social perspectives in an attempt to highlight the key reasons as to why the drone attacks have failed to win the war on terror in the region. This chapter uses a range of sources including information regarding Pakistan's official policy about drone attacks, Pakistan's politics and drone attacks, the public reaction to the drone strikes, the media reaction in Pakistan and the United States, the views portrayed on social media sites regarding the subject and the development of problems regarding sovereignty because of the drone strike attacks in northwest Pakistan.

Prior to the discussion of the situation in Pakistan, it is necessary to briefly re-state the specific research questions that have been developed solely for the purpose of this work. To ensure that a fair and objective discussion takes place, the research study aims on analyzing the situation from different perspectives while attempting to discover why the drone attacks in

Pakistan in a specific region have not helped US to win the war on terror, what could be reasons that these attacks have not been successful, if the attacks have increased the anti-US feeling in Pakistan and whether the drone strikes are an effective strategy when looked at within the main context of the war on terror from the theoretical perspective that underlines the analysis. Each section discusses the topic from a particular perspective, using secondary sources to analyze the drone strike strategy and then places the findings in the context of the neo-liberalist theoretical perspective, identifying how each aspect of the analysis approaches the strategy and whether a positivist answer can be achieved.

4.2 A military perspective

Initially, it is important to highlight why the assumption was made that the use of drone attacks has not been successful in a military manner, helping to dispel the argument that the use of the attacks has allowed any particular headway into the war on terror. The difficulty of gaining access to official US documents regarding the drone strikes have meant that this part of the study relies on information from academic sources as well as from new reports from reputable sources. The military perspective, when viewed from the position of the United States government is that the use of drone warfare is an effective tactic in the war against terror. The US underlines that drone strikes are accurate, do not risk the lives of US soldiers in combat, can target terrorist activity and targets the swift removal of terrorist threats once they have been discovered in areas that are almost inaccessible to man. The drone strikes are conducted under the leadership of the Central Intelligence Agency. (CIA) The CIA underlines that its military affairs have been altered since 9/11 and that the:

“CIA formally established the joined elements under the Associate Director for Military Affairs. (ADMA) in 2007. Today, ADMA is jointly manned by Agency and uniformed military professionals, operating as one team to coordinate, plan, execute, and sustain joint CIA and DOD worldwide activities based upon priorities established by the Director of the CIA, to achieve National Security objectives”. (CIA, 2013)

Under the CIA and its joint operations with the Department of Defense. (DOD), the US has launched its drone program but the extent to which it has succeed has been debated ever since the program was launched. The literature on the subject highlights that the US is persistence in the use of the drone strategy and it has interrupted terrorist organizations rather

than put an end to any of them. A study by Williams notes that the Obama administration has kept on with the Bush administration's tactic of drone strikes, even though it is described as 'its best, "worst option" in the campaign against Al Qaeda and the Taliban'. Moreover, his study underlines that 'while the Pakistani officials continue to publicly protest the strikes, most notably after a March 17, 2011 drone strike in the tribal areas that killed as many as forty Pashtun elders, they kept silent and secretly tolerate them'. (Williams 2011, p.224) This acceptance by the Pakistani government is often debated and this will be discussed later. However, it is clear that the US continues to adopt its drone program strategy even though it has seemingly failed in making serious in-roads into the elimination of terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda.

Furthermore, the past few months prior to the beginning of this research study have witnessed the growth of strong demand to reduce and eventually replace the drone program, perhaps in a sign that the US government is willing to accept the overall failure of the strategy over the ten-year length of its existence. In a speech on May 23, President Obama is quoted as saying that 'From our use of drones to the detention of terrorist suspects, the decisions we are making will define the type of nation – and world – that we leave to our children... There is a wide gap between U.S. assessments of such casualties, and non-governmental reports. Nevertheless, it is a hard fact that U.S. strikes have resulted in civilian casualties, a risk that exists in all wars. For the families of those civilians, no words or legal construct can justify their loss'. (Obama, 2013) Due to this belief that drone strikes have seemingly hit innocent civilians and terrorists alike, Obama announced that 'over the last four years, my Administration has worked vigorously to establish a framework that governs our use of force against terrorists – insisting upon clear guidelines, oversight and accountability that is now codified in Presidential Policy Guidance. (PPG) that I signed yesterday'. (Obama, 2013) This introduction of the PPG indicates that far greater controls are being placed on the use of drone attacks, perhaps in realization that the strategy has failed to this point. This failure is acknowledged by President Obama when he stated that the use of drone attacks and acting without the Pakistani government's support with regard to Osama Bin Laden meant that 'the cost to our relationship with Pakistan – and the backlash among the Pakistani public over encroachment on their territory – was so severe that we are just now beginning to rebuild this important partnership'. (Obama, 2013) These points indicate that the drone strike strategy has not been as effective as would have been hoped by the US government when the plan was launched in 2004.

The military perspective is the only viewpoint that does not highlight the failure of the drone strike program, instead claiming that it is working but needs to be adapted to ensure greater success. This should perhaps be read as the admission of defeat but the inability to claim so, due to the potential backlash from the media, society in general and the terrorist organizations that the program has been targeting specifically. From the analysis of the US military perspective, it is clear that the drone strikes are viewed as an essential part of the war against terror strategy. From this perspective, it is apparent that the US has approached the situation from a neo-realist point of view, with the belief that the country is engaged in a war against terror that threatens its position in global society, the security of US citizens and soldiers at home and abroad and that it believes drone strikes are a necessity in this situation. However, it also appears that the US seems to be oblivious to the view of global co-operation and the need to achieve positive relations with countries such as Pakistan that could have an important impact on the war against terror. Using the northern region of Pakistan as a bombing ground seems to go against the view of neo-liberalism and rejects the notion of co-operation, identifying that the US subscribes to the theory of neo-realism in an increasingly neo-liberal global society. This outlines the difficulty in aligning the two views and is perhaps why the US will continue to use the drone strike strategy, even as it alienates the Pakistani population further.

4.3 Pakistan's response to drone attacks

Having analyzed the military perspective, it is clear that the United States government and military would never admit to the strategy being a failure in public. However, the desire to alter course and change the strategy in recent years is perhaps a response to the view that the government has realized that the use of the drone strike strategy has permanently. (or at least for the foreseeable future) impacted negatively on the relationship between the United States and Pakistan. To analyze the government and military perspective further, it is necessary to consider the political aspects of the drone strike strategy, using it to assess whether the relationship has become strained because of it and why it is felt that the strategy is ineffective when viewed through this manner.

The analysis of the Pakistani government's stance on the use of drone attacks by the United States is one of the most complex aspects of this entire subject. This section aims to assess both the official and unofficial stances held by the Pakistani government, as well as

discuss the possibility of secret meetings and agreements between the US and Pakistan in relation to these attacks. The literature is somewhat divided on this subject. A recent study by Goswami indicates that ‘according to Pakistan, drone attacks are counterproductive and are helping the Taliban to ferment anti-government and anti-US sentiments among common Pakistani’. (Goswami 2012, p.206) To further this claim, the work by Goswami quoted the Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari as saying that ‘we feel the strikes are invasion on our sovereignty, which are not appreciate by most of the Pakistani people, at the first aspect of the war is to win the hearts and minds of the people’. (Goswami 2012, p.206) Using this information, it is possible to surmise that the official stance is one of displeasure and anger at the use of drone attacks on Pakistani soil.

The viewpoint that the Pakistani government is against the drone strategy has been heightened and supported by another recent release of information provided by a Pakistani government statement made in June 2013. It was underlined that the new Pakistani Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif ‘wasted no time on Saturday in lodging a formal diplomatic complaint with Washington over a U.S. drone strike that reportedly killed seven militants near the Afghan border... It was also stressed that these drone strikes have a negative impact on the mutual desire of both countries to forge a cordial and cooperative relationship and to ensure peace and stability in the region’. (Neuman, 2013, p.1) It is also apparent that the potential shift in the relationship paradigm between both governments can be an important factor in determining how the political perspective views the drone attacks.

The study by Neuman stressed that the new Prime Minister of Pakistan was elected partly because of the campaign promise ‘to aggressively push back against the unilateral strikes, saying they breached Pakistani sovereignty and inflamed anti-American sentiment in the country’. (Neuman, 2013, p.1) Therefore, the analysis of the political perspective is likely to change depending on the individuals in power, both in Washington and in Pakistan. The analysis has indicated that while President Obama continued the work of Bush with the drone strategy, Sharif’s role as the new Prime Minister has focused on becoming more outspoken and critical of the strategy used by the US, reflecting a possible paradigm shift and worsening of relations between the two countries. Funk supports the belief that the opposing of the drone strategy could provide Pakistani politicians with a bump in the polls. Her work notes that all of the leaders of the political parties in Pakistan ‘all oppose the current U.S. drone strikes in the country. Stating public opposition to U.S. drone strikes was a pre-requisite for Pakistani politicians to gain success in recent elections held on May 11, reflecting public outrage over

the strikes'. (Funk, 2013, p.1) The need to reflect public opinion underlines how important the issue of drone strikes is to the Pakistani people, particularly as politicians are now basing campaigns around the opposition to such strikes. The link between the political and the social elements of this discussion is key to fully understanding why the US strategy has failed over this ten-year period.

The combination of politics and social views on the issue of drone strikes underlines the view that the drone strikes have been ineffective. The work so far has assessed that after almost ten years of drone strikes hitting the northwest region of Pakistan, the war on terror has still not been won and that the attacks seem to simply be leading to a growth of anti-US sentiment in the region, which in turn is fuelling recruits and the radicalization of potential young terrorists. One of the main difficulties that the US has had has been the ability to utilize the Pakistani resources to help to seek out terrorists. This failure to achieve this has led to drone attacks in the FATA region that has been led to the problems associated with drones such as the inability to tell between terrorist and civilian, leading to a high toll of civilian deaths and changing the public opinion against US.

The US first experienced negative public opinion in the Vietnam War, with the government facing opposition from American citizens because of the impact of the media and the manner in which it brought the fighting into the average American living room. This situation in Pakistan is slightly different but by no means less important. The use of drones on the FATA region, which is viewed as a 'breeding ground for Islamic terrorists not only associated with al Qaeda, but with radical groups...with the FATA region being home to Lashkar-e-Taiba. (LeT), Jaish-e-Mohammed. (JeM) and Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan. (TTP)'. (Reeson, 2011, p.148) The lack of accuracy by the drone strikes has meant that rather than wiping out the terrorist organizations that reside in the FATA region, the use of power but failure to win the public support has once again hurt the American military, with those impressionable young Pakistani's likely to turn to radicalism because of the fact that the killing of civilians is being reported by the all kind of today's media and almost everybody has access to information these days by different means of latest technology.

This has therefore presented a situation in which the political elite could be a key to gain support from sections of the Pakistani public but they actually driven up the anti-US sentiment in the region to gain the success in political career. Therefore, through the political and social perspectives, it is evident that the two combined have led to the rise up of

hardliners in politics. Use of drone attacks in northwest region of Pakistan is playing a dramatic role to increase of anti-US sentiment in whole country. This situation is not leading to the way (demolishing and minimizing the terrorist organizations and terrorism) at least the United States government assumed. The assessment of the sources on the subject, when evaluated through the use of the secondary-source case study analysis, has acknowledged that the rising anti-US sentiment has led to increased support for terrorist organizations by a small minority of Pakistani society, but it has also led to the rise of general antipathy towards the US by the wider public. This has made it far easier to get away with hardline rhetoric by people like Sharif, because of the view that the US has acted illegally by killing civilians as a common occurrence, placing Pakistan in the 'moral right' in the situation.

When placed within the concept of neoliberalism, it is apparent that the drone strategy used by the US military has soured relations between the US and Pakistani governments. Although there was initial support for the strike, the Pakistani government has more recently become critical of the strategy because of the impact on Pakistani civilians and the desire to appease its population. The concept of neoliberalism identifies that the deteriorating relationship between the two governments has led to increased support for a new strategy, although this has not yet been achieved or put in place by the US. Therefore, it is clear that the Pakistani support for the drone strikes has waned and because of this, the relationship has been strained over the past few years. Looking at the situation from the positivist standpoint, it is evident that the Pakistani government has come to view the drone strike strategy as one that does not present a viable long-term solution and that this has caused a worsening diplomatic relationship between the two countries. However, the view from the two governments is often seen as confusing and contradictory. For example, this assessment has indicated that the Pakistani government has offered both its support and opposition to the drone strike strategy, meaning that the analysis within a specific theory is perhaps hard to achieve.

4.4 Social perspectives concerning drone attacks

With the military and political perspectives evaluated, it is apparent that the official stance is one of a necessary but difficult decision made concerning the use of drone strikes. However, even though President Obama has acknowledged the worsening of the United States-Pakistani relationship, and the Pakistani government's official stance condemning the

attacks, it has been highlighted that the two governments may have come together in secret and agreed the course of action together. This would suggest collaboration on the use of the drone strategy and therefore does not accurately answer where the anger concerning the use of the drone strikes strategy comes from. Therefore, it is important to assess public opinion, viewing the situation through a social perspective, as well as later in the work identifying the impact of the media and how the drone strike strategy has become a negative issue, both in the United States and Pakistan, as well as in other countries around the world. The analysis aims to show that the social perspective is one that has grown in importance, especially with the increased role of the media and the growth of social media applications in global society. Using the case study approach, key sources have been assessed and they help to indicate that one of the major reasons for the failure of the drone strike is the creation of anti-US sentiment in Pakistan, the surrounding region and the wider global society, catalyzed by the role that the media has played a role to develop the debate about these attacks. This would seem to reflect that it is appropriate to assess the social attitude towards drone strikes within the neoliberalism theory, with the actions of national governments impacting upon relationships with other populations, as seen in this current scenario.

The availability of sources on the subject of the social perspective stress that the reaction to the drone strikes has taken a number of important forms. One of the most dangerous forms, and perhaps why the United States are unlikely to ever win the war on terror when using force, is the view that the drone strike strategy has actually led to the further radicalization of both Pakistan and Afghanistan, meaning that more potential members of the terrorist networks and organizations have been signing up following the ineffective use of drones in the region. A study by Awan quotes that although the US government celebrates drone strike hits on terrorists as a success, the truth may be less positive than they suppose. For example, a recent drone strike that killed the ‘Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan. (TTP) second in command Wali ur Rehman has again raised the contentious issue about the legality of US drone strikes in Pakistan... underneath this bravado lays a very serious question and that is" despite killing high profile figures such as Wali ur Rehman and Baitullah Mehsud in 2009, the methods used to target the Taliban may in actual fact be acting as a recruitment tool for extremist organizations in Pakistan who have an apathy towards the Taliban’. (Awan, 2013, p.1) In this manner, although this is possibly only a very small minority of the wider civilian population, it is evident that the use of drone strikes may be backfiring on the US aim to eliminate all terrorist threats in the area. Although this is an extreme action, its occurrence

underlines that the drone strike strategy, when viewed through a social perspective should be seen as a failing strategy when assessed from a neoliberal standpoint.

The social perspective of the situation therefore raises the question concerning the radicalization of new members for terrorist groups that operate in the FATA, including that of TTP. However, this should be acknowledged that it is a very small minority of individuals that have been transformed by the drone strikes and who now wish to join the terrorist network. Despite this, it is a disturbing situation and this form of radicalization represents the general shift in attitude towards the United States and the overall use of the drone strike strategy. The work has already stressed that the public opinion has rejected the drone strike strategy and that because of this politicians have hardened their stance against the US in their election rhetoric. However, by using a survey conducted by the Aryana Institute for Regional Research and Advocacy. (AIRRA, 2009), the study has been able to assess the impact of the drone strikes directly on the Pakistani population in the FATA region.

The survey, conducted in 2009 provides important information regarding the public opinion relating to the drone attacks. The use of this primary research helps to underline how the opinion towards drone attacks has been gradually changing in the region. The survey highlighted that AIRRA sent 'five teams, each made up of five researchers, to the parts of FATA that are often hit by American drones, to conduct a survey of public opinion about the attacks. The team visited Wana. (South Waziristan), Ladda. (South Waziristan), Miranshah. (North Waziristan), Razmak. (North Waziristan) and Parachinar. (Kurrum Agency) The teams handed out 650 structured questionnaires to people in the areas'. (AIRRA, 2009, p.1) The results of the questionnaire found that the use of drone attacks brought about a rise in fear and terror among civilians and that only half of the participants felt that the drone strikes were accurate. Interestingly, when asked whether the participants thought that anti-American feelings in the area had increased due to the use of drone attacks, the majority. (58%) responded negatively. This is a finding that has been argued against by other studies with the view held that the Pakistani civilian population has developed an anti-US attitude because of the drone strikes.

The public opinion survey conducted by the AIRRA places the analysis squarely within the remit of the neoliberalist theory. The theory subscribes to the view that progress in international relations can be achieved only through international co-operation and that international institutions can help countries resolve their differences peacefully. Therefore, as

the social perspective in Pakistan has witnessed an increase in anti-US sentiment, from the neoliberalist view this suggests that the drone strike strategy is ineffective, leading to a worsening attitude towards the US and its tactics in the country where the drone strikes are taking place. The increase in support for terrorist groups, albeit relatively small, is a worrying sign and should be taken by the US and Pakistani governments that the strategy is clearly not working. With the aim to decrease the size of terrorist networks in the region, the view that the attacks have led to more members signing up is one that reflects the failure of the strategy. This would seem to suggest that the US strategy needs to change into one of a more understanding nature of the situation, working on changing the education of the Pakistani population rather than simply using drone strikes in a manner that often kills civilians. It is thought that anti-US sentiment would likely decrease if this new type of strategy was introduced. By using the neoliberal viewpoint of global relations, it is apparent that it helps to explain the reasons as to why there are serious failings in the drone strategy, such as the alienation of the Pakistani population and the growth in support for terrorist organizations in the northern region of the country.

4.5 Influence of media (including social media)

The final area to be explored prior to the overall analysis of the subject is that of the influence of the media, including the role that social media has played a role in the development of the anti-US feeling in Pakistan following the continued implementation of the drone strike strategy. The power of the media in recent years and its ability to reach and influence entire populations, has been penned down as one of the major factors as to why the drone strike strategy in the remote northwest region of Pakistan has become such a central issue in society. It is noted in the study by Kaltenthaler, Miller and Fair that:

“One of the major reasons why the drone strikes have become such a salient issue among so much of the Pakistani general public is that there is a large amount of media coverage of the drone issue. The killing of major Al Qaeda, Pakistani or Afghan Taliban figures gets regular coverage in the Pakistani print media. (such as the newspapers *Dawn* in English and *Jang* in Urdu), as well as television and radio. But the collateral damage from drone strikes also gets major play in the Pakistani media outlets”. (2012, p.2)

The study here recognizes that the media has a fundamental role to play in the development of the public opinion on the drone strategy. The impact of the media is perhaps the major factor involved in turning the public opinion against the drone strategy and this has been seen with the use of graphic images and the constant repetition of the civilian death count. The role of the media, and in particular that of the Internet, is seen as a key way in which messages concerning certain events have spread across the global community. A recent analysis of the impact that social media has had on the drone strikes in Pakistan underlines that although the US drone strike strategy is in theory, a private military strategy aimed at removing terrorist insurgents, it has now become common knowledge and each attack is reported on wide scale. The study by Bauman and Lyon notes that ‘everything private is now done, potentially in public and is potentially available for public consumption: and remains available for the duration, till the end of time, as they Internet cannot be made to forget’. (Bauman & Lyon 2013, p.161) The role that the media has had, especially in this modern age of instant communication can be seen as vital in developing and transforming the views held concerning the nature of the drone attacks and the public perception of the attacks.

The drone strikes continue to be reported in the media on a daily basis. The most recent report at the time of writing this study came at the beginning of July 2013. A report in the Huffington Post noted that:

‘an unmanned US aircraft fired four missiles at a house in northwest Pakistan before dawn Wednesday, killing 16 suspected militants...the drone strike elicited a swift condemnation by the Pakistani government, which released a statement saying the strikes are a violation of its sovereignty...U.S. drone strikes have become a serious source of tension between Washington and Islamabad. The Pakistani government regularly denounces the strikes as a violation of the country's sovereignty, even though senior officials are known to have supported some of the attacks in the past’. (Dawar, 2013, p.1)

This report underlines that there is continued debate over the use of drones and even though the article did not mention that the attack injured or killed any civilians, it is apparent from the writing style that the drone strike strategy elicits a negative response from the Pakistani government and its peoples. In this manner, it is clear that the use of the media has a vital impact on the way that the drone strike strategy has been viewed around the world and because of this, the failure of the overall US strategy that focuses on the use of drones could

be said to have occurred through the image portrayed by the media and the constant reporting of civilian casualties that have developed anti-US feeling in Pakistan and across the global community.

The discussion of the influence of the media helps to explain why the drone strike strategy has failed in this modern society, increasing the need to view the situation through a neoliberal lens. The constant highlight reel of US drone strikes, coupled with the growth of anti-US feeling reported by journalists and civilians around the world, has led to the increasing anger towards the strategy. The globalization of the world's media, through official media outlets as well as social media mediums, reflect the changing nature of the global society and that the neoliberal approach should be viewed as the most appropriate method of assessment in this type of situation. Through the neoliberal reasoning, the US strategy is ineffective because the US has sought to fight a limited type of warfare aiming to reduce the threat of terror aimed at the US, but this has occurred in an increasingly linked and global international society. Therefore, the reporting of the media has eased the development of anti-US sentiment and the images of bombs exploding and killing civilians has become a dominant force in the discussion of the effectiveness of the strategy. Through this, the analysis has been able to explain why the anti-US sentiment has grown and that in this global society, a strategy more suited to a neorealist approach has failed in achieving its goals.

4.6 Analysis conclusion

The analysis of the sources in the previous sections underline that the drone strike strategy, as launched by the United States in 2004, has failed to achieve its aims and therefore it should be viewed as a failed strategy. This work has attempted to present a critical consideration of the impact of the drone attacks in Pakistan and why they have not helped to win the war on terror. In this chapter, the results of the study are assessed using the findings from the review of the empirical literature. The United States government introduced the drone strike strategy because it was a specific and precise method of targeting the terrorist threat faced in Afghanistan and northwestern Pakistan and it was thought that by using it, the US would be able to limit the activity of terrorists in the region and gradually wipe out the terrorist organizations that habited the area. However, there are clearly reasons that have led to the failure of this strategy.

One of the most compelling arguments is that the United States use of drones, although stated as a precise weapon that would reduce or limit civilian casualties, has actually

led to perhaps far more civilian deaths and injuries than those of the terrorists that have been the primary and only target. In this manner, it is apparent that the primary factor involved in the failure of the drone strike strategy is that of the non-specific targeting of individuals that has led to the killing of innocent victims. Although this is a key reason for the failure, it is necessary to present the argument in a wider context, arguing why this failure has been brought to life in the media and why it has created such a stir among opponents of the drone strike strategy in Pakistan and around the world. The study was underpinned by a neoliberal paradigm, allowing the study to assess the situation using the neoliberalism theory that focuses mainly on tenets of international cooperation, aiming to see the social impact of the US military strike and providing reasons as to why this has been a failure. When looked at from a neorealist point of view, the US drone strike has perhaps been slightly more successful, due to the general premise of the anarchic system and the need for individual states to proactively seek security. However, even within this neorealist argument, the overall success of the strategy could be debated with the US not more secure following the use of the strategy. Indeed, by angering Pakistan, the US may have possibly reduced their level of security because of the growth in support for terrorist groups in the region and the development of anti-US sentiment that further threatens security.

The work aimed to assess the situation using a neoliberal position though and this has meant that the focus has been on the social and political perspectives of the situation, with the overall view that international cooperation is the most successful path to peace for countries in modern society. Through this viewpoint, it is evident that the drone strike has been a failure. Rather than increase support for the strategy, the ineffectiveness of the drone targeting has led to the rise of anti-US sentiment and condemnation from all areas of global society. Moreover, it should also be acknowledged that the neoliberal debate is one that focuses on the attitude of international organizations, thereby highlighting the reaction of international institutions such as the United Nations and NATO. (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) This section presents a discussion of the findings and provides the importance of the study for the development of US-Pakistani relations moving on into the future.

When considering the information gained from the secondary source analysis, it is apparent that the drone attacks have not been successful in helping the US to win the war on terror, mainly because the use of violence in a civilian-populated region (although scarcely populated and remote) has instilled anti-US sentiment in the area and the country as a whole. The study aimed to discover the reasons why the strategy has failed to win the war on terror

and it is clear that the use of violence by the United States has led to the creation of fear and anger in Pakistan. Through the social and political perspectives with which this study was conducted, it is apparent that the use of violence by the United States goes against the desire to remove terrorism from the region, simply because it has led to anger and resentment, culminating in a small number of individuals becoming more radicalized and fuelling the terrorist groups in the region. The survey by the AIRRA group acknowledged that anti-US feeling had not gone up since the use of drone strikes occurred, but this was back in 2009 when the survey took place. The more recent work on the subject indicates that the civilian attitude has been one that has increasingly rejected the drone strike strategy, so much so that politicians in the most recent elections used the anti-US sentiment among the population, trying to gain support by appearing to be a hard-liner against the strategy.

Therefore, the main reason for the failure of the drone strategy to defeat terrorism in Pakistan, specifically the FATA region and the destruction of terrorist groups and the network in the region, has been the manner in which the drone attacks have developed anti-US feeling in the country. This has translated into a general feeling of resentment and anger for the majority of the population and also led to the radicalization of a specific few. The reasons behind this development of anti-US feeling though can be put down to the effectiveness of the media. The United States has perhaps failed to realize that in this modern society, the power of the media is tremendous and the constant new reports covering drone attacks and civilian deaths have managed to transform the way the Pakistani public has viewed the situation. This has led to the growth of anti-US feeling on the social media sites and helped to spread the sentiment across the country. It is still important to highlight that the vast majority of Pakistani's view the terrorist networks as morally wrong and reprehensible and that there is still a dire need to remove them from society. However, in terms of the drone strikes as the primary strategy, it is apparent that this is simply not working and that it is necessary for the United States to change their tactic immediately rather than simply worsen the political relationship that they currently have with Pakistan. The assessment of the neoliberal reasoning underlines that the US strategy has been ineffective, particularly when considering the impact of the media on the situation. It was noted in the analysis that because the US has fought a limited type of warfare aiming to reduce the threat of terror aimed at the US, this has occurred in an increasingly linked and global international society and therefore it is understood that this limited war tactic has proved ineffective and reported as such in the global media. Therefore, the reporting of the media has eased the development of anti-US

sentiment and the images of bombs exploding and killing civilians has become a dominant force in the discussion of the effectiveness of the strategy. Overall, the neoliberal assessment (when the theory is placed in practice), highlights that the use of the drone strategy has caused the US to receive negative press from the global media and furthermore, it has led to the worsening of the relationship between the US and Pakistani governments. This latter part is true, especially because the Pakistani population has begun to view the drone strikes as ineffective and damaging to the country. It is thought that this anti-US sentiment has developed because of, and led to negative reporting by the global media (social and professional).

5. Conclusion

There are a number of conclusions that can be drawn from this study. This chapter is divided into two main sections. First, the major findings that were drawn from the research analysis on the subject of the failure of the US drone strategy in Pakistan are discussed and highlighted. Following this, the work provides key recommendations for the future, both in terms of the need for a change in strategy by the US and also in terms of future study. Although this current study was successful in achieving its goals, there is much more to learn and this can only be achieved through a commissioned practical research study on the subject. Ideas for this future study are presented in the second part of the chapter.

5.1 Main conclusion

The research study aimed to assess the impact of drone attacks in Pakistan and why they are not helping to win the war on terror. This theory that that war on terror was not being won was the basic idea of this study at the beginning of the work and all of the findings on the subject point to the fact that this is indeed true. The work focused on looking at why the drone attacks have not helped win the war on terror, the reasons behind this, the extent to which the attacks have increased anti-US sentiment in Pakistan and whether the overall strategy was an effective one in the context of the war on terror. The assessment of the situation was underpinned by the international relations theory of neoliberalism. Basing the study within a neoliberal debate, the work attempted to focus mainly on the tenets of international cooperation, aiming to assess the social and political impact of the US military strike and providing the reasons within these two main perspectives as to why the strategy has failed.

The use of the neoliberal position to discuss this situation concerning drone strikes enabled the study to focus on the social and political responses and developments following the decade long use of the strategy, rather than simply discuss the military reasons for the strategy as constantly repeated by the United States government. Using this neoliberal theory, it was possible to conclude that the US drone strike strategy in the northwest region of Pakistan has failed for a selection of important reasons. First of all it is important to underline that the theory made at the beginning of this work was correct. The US drone strike strategy has failed to improve the US situation in the war on terror. The aims of the strategy (to be counted as a military victory) relied upon the dissolution of the terrorist network in the mountainous region of Pakistan and Afghanistan and although certain important terrorist personnel have been killed through the use of these drone strikes, the attacks have also killed civilians, leading to the first major reason for the failure of the strategy.

The neoliberal theory was defined as a philosophical position that argued that progress in international relations can be achieved only through international co-operation. When using this definition as the basis of the theory in which the US drone strategy was assessed, it is clear that from the perspectives of the Pakistani population, its government and the wider social and global media that the drone strategy is ineffective and has led to worsening political relations because of the situation. In this manner, it is appropriate to highlight that the work, when viewed through the neoliberal perspective, identifies that the drone attacks in Pakistan not helped to win the war on terror, these attacks have not been successful because of the negative impact that it has had on the Pakistani-US relationship and the fact that it has spurred many individuals to join terrorist organizations in the country. Furthermore, when viewed from a neoliberal perspective, it is clear that the drone strikes should not be viewed as an effective strategy in an overall manner because of the failures associated with the drone attacks that were evaluated in this work.

The work set out to discover why the drone attacks had not helped win the war on terror, the reasons involved, the extent to which anti-US feeling had grown and whether the drone strategy was an effective one when looked within the main context of the war on terror. The study concludes that the drone strikes have not helped to win the war on terror and that they are actually a major part of why this victory has not yet occurred. The cold-hearted manner with which the US seem to launch drone strike attacks have led to the development of the view that the US does not care for international laws and has no desire to take Pakistan sovereignty into account. This viewpoint has been developed through a social perspective

through the role of the media, which tends to condemn all drone strike attacks conducted by the US in Pakistan. Moreover, it is underlined that through the social and political perspectives, the US can be seen to exert its dominance in the region due to its power, regardless of the attitude of the native population, increasing anti-US sentiment all the while.

The conclusion should also acknowledge that the role of the media has helped spread the anti-US feeling far more rapidly than would have been previously possible in the region. The access to the Internet, the use of social media sites and the global coverage of the situation means that reports of civilian casualties has been a common occurrence over the past 10 years and this has seemingly strengthened the terrorist resolve, turned the public against the US strategy and also led in some cases to the further radicalization of the Pakistani youth.

5.2 Recommendations

This study aimed to discover the impact of the drone attacks in Pakistan and why they have not helped to win the war on terror yet. The study was successful although there were certain limitations that were acknowledged in the methodology chapter. These limitations focused mainly on the lack of resources that existed within the study that prevented the completion of any practical primary research in this work. Despite this central limitation, the analysis of the secondary sources enabled the results to achieve some semblance of conclusion and completion in this study. However, there are several recommendations that need to be made regarding both the direction of US strategy in the region as well as the wider war on terror more generally and in terms of further study into this specific topic.

The major limitation of this study was its reliance on secondary source information. The secondary source analysis approach worked well within its immediate environment but it still only truly provided the researcher with a general and simplified view on what is becoming a very complex subject. The use of drone strikes has been shown to be a failed attempt made by the US to win the war on terror. The development of anti-US sentiment in the region has meant that the US now faces an extremely tough task in developing peaceful relations with the Pakistani population. Therefore, rather than complete a secondary source analysis on the subject, the next step (particularly if the US continues its drone strike strategy) would be for research to be conducted in a primary manner, with a researcher interviewing key personnel from the US and Pakistani governments, the Pakistani media and influential social media bloggers and personalities in the country. This type of study would help to provide key information regarding how the people of the country feel, as well as the official

lines taken by both governments. This type of study would perhaps only be feasible if it was completed in conjunction with another university or educational institution, either in the United States or Pakistan. Despite the need for collaboration, it is expected that the results would be extremely insightful and could help develop the knowledge on this subject greatly.

Another area of analysis for this topic could be the focus on the military element of the drone strike strategy. This study has highlighted numerous times that although the drone strike strategy appears to have been unsuccessful over the past decade, the US government has still stuck to the story that it has been successful, helping the country to win the war on terror despite much evidence to the contrary. A study that objectively analyzes the strategy from a military perspective, ignoring the other aspects such as the political and social contexts as assessed in this paper, could help to provide firm evidence either way that the strategy is a success or a failure. The continuing use of the strategy is expensive for the US, potentially damaging for its foreign relations and is perhaps leading to a new generation of terrorist coming through the ranks, outraged at the US' low level of regard for civilian life. Therefore, the continuation of this strategy is either down to the refusal to admit a 10 year mistake, or because the strategy has actually been a success. The recommended study would attempt to highlight which of these two outcomes was the most likely in terms of the military effectiveness of the drone strike strategy.

The one area that this study did not cover in any great detail, mainly because it was not part of the research aim or a focus of any of the research questions, was that of possible alternatives to the drone strike strategy. Although some alternatives were touched upon in the analysis, such as the increased level of collaboration between the US and Pakistani authorities to conduct covert operations to remove terrorist cells, as well as the view that heightened education could help reduce the number of terrorist sympathizers in Pakistani society, this was not a major focus of this work. Therefore, it is recommended that having underlined the failure of the drone strike strategy, it is necessary to conduct a study that measures the merits of other possible methods that could be used to win the war on terror. There are clearly positives and negatives associated with each type of method, hence the need to use the drone strike strategy in the first place but it is thought that an objective analysis of different strategies, especially underpinned by the theory of neoliberalism, could help to shed new light on the subject and provide the government in Washington with new insight on the subject.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Akbar. (2013) *The thistle and the drone: how America's war on terror became a global war on tribal Islam*. Washington D.C: Brookings Institute Press.
- AIRRA. (2009) *Drone attacks – a survey*.
[<http://www.airra.org/newsandanalysis/droneattacksurvey.php>], accessed 24 July 2013.
- Anwar, Muhammad. & Baig, Ebad. (2012) *Pakistan: time for change*. New York: AuthorHouse.
- Baldwin, David. (1993) *Neorealism and neoliberalism: the contemporary debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt & Lyon, David. (2013) *Liquid surveillance: a conversation*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Benjamin, Medea. (2013) *Drone warfare: killing by remote control*. New York: Verso Books.
- CIA. (2013) 'What we do.' [<https://www.cia.gov/offices-of-cia/military-affairs/history.html>], accessed 18 July 2013.
- Collins, Hilary. (2010) *Creative research: the theory and practice of research for the creative industries*. New York: AVA Publishing.
- Creswell, John. (2009) *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*. London: SAGE.
- Creswell, John. & Clark, Vicki. (2010) *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. London: SAGE.
- Dawar, Rasool. (2013) *US drone strike in Pakistan kills 16 militants in North Waziristan*.
[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/03/us-drone-strike-in-pakistan_n_3536644.html], accessed 27 July 2013.
- Duncan, Raymond., Jancar-Webster, Barbara. & Switky, Bob. (2008) *World politics in the 21st century*. London: Cengage Learning.
- Dunne, Tim., Kurki, Milja. & Smith, Steve. (2007) *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2003) *Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Funk, Lindsay. (2013) *Pakistan Election 2013*.
[<http://www.policymic.com/articles/31457/pakistan-election-2013-how-outrage-over-u-s-drones-could-shape-the-election>], accessed 26 July 2013.

- George, Alexander. & Bennett, Andrew. (2005) *Case Studies and Theoretical Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Goswami, Arvind. (2012) *3 D deceit, duplicity and dissimulation of US foreign policy towards India, Pakistan and Afghanistan*. New York: AuthorHouse.
- Gram, Dennis. (2012) 'Drone strikes in Pakistan kill on terrorists for every 50 deaths.' [<http://www.policymic.com/articles/15340/drone-strikes-in-pakistan-have-killed-thousands-of-civilians>], accessed 17 July 2013.
- Gunaratna, Rohan. & Iqbal, Khuram. (2012) *Pakistan: terrorism ground zero*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Haimes, Yacov. & Steuer, Ralph. (2000) *Research and practice in multiple criteria decision-making*. New York: Springer.
- Halperin, Sandra. & Heath, Oliver. (2012) *Political Research: Methods and Practical Skills*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic. (Stanford Law School) and Global Justice Clinic. (NYU School of Law). (2012) *Living under drones: death, injury and trauma to civilians from US drone practices in Pakistan*. [http://livingunderdrones.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Stanford_NYU_LIVING_UNDER_DRONES.pdf], accessed 17 July 2013.
- Jackson, Robert. & Sorensen, Georg. (2007) *Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janz, Nicole. (2010) *And no one will keep that light from shining: civil religion after September 11 in speeches of George W. Bush*. Munich: LIT Verlag Munster.
- Kahl, C. (2008). *International relations, international security and comparative politics: a guide to reference and information sources*. California: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Kaltenthaler, Karl., Miller, William & Fair, Christine. (2012) 'The drone war: Pakistan public attitudes toward American drone strikes in Pakistan.' [<http://www.uakron.edu/dotAsset/4823799c-34eb-4b4f-992e-ac4a2261e0c4.pdf>], accessed 24 July 2013.
- Klotz, A. & Lynch, C. (2007). *Strategies for research in constructivist international relations*. New York: M.E Sharpe.
- McGrath, Kevin. (2011) *Confronting Al Qaeda: new strategies to combat terrorism*. Washington D.C: Naval Institute Press.
- Mohanty, Nirode. (2013) *America, Pakistan and the India factor*. New York: Palgrave

Macmillan.

- Moses, Jonathon. & Knutsen, Torbjorn. (2007) *Ways of Knowledge: Competing Methodologies in Social and Political Research*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Murphy, Eamon. (2012) *The making of terrorism in Pakistan: historical and social roots of extremism*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Mustafa, Ahmed. (2008) *Case study method, theory and practice*. Boston: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.
- Neuman, Steve. (2013) *Pakistan's new government protests US drone strike*. [<http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/06/08/189817233/pakistans-new-government-protests-u-s-drone-strike>], accessed 26 July 2013.
- Obama, Barack. (2013) 'President Barack Obama's speech at National Defense University – full text'. [<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/23/obama-drones-guantanamo-speech-text>], accessed 18 July 2013.
- Rashid, Ahmed. (2012) *Pakistan on the brink: the future of America, Pakistan and Afghanistan*. London: Penguin.
- Reeson, Greg. (2011) *Stalemate: why we can't win the war on terror and what we should do instead*. Washington D.C: Government Institutes.
- Rotberg, Robert., Rabb, Theodore. & Gilpin, Robert. (1989) *The origin and prevention of major wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Somekh, Bridget. & Lewin, Cathy. (2005) *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: SAGE.
- Stake, Robert. (1995) *The art of case study research*. London: SAGE.
- Sutch, Peter. & Elias, Juanita. (2007) *International relations: the basics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Weber, Cynthia. (2009) *International relations theory: a critical introduction*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Williams, Brian. (2011) *Afghanistan declassified: a guide to America's longest war*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Yin, Robert. (2009) *Case study research: design and methods*. London: SAGE.