

Drone Attacks in Pakistan during the Obama Era: Impact on the US–Pakistan Relations

Dalir Khan¹, Saira Baig²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Pakistan.

²Doctoral Scholar, School of Politics and International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Correspondence: dalirkhattak@gmail.com¹

ABSTRACT

Aim of the Study: The research investigates consequences of the drone attacks by the United States in Pakistan during Obama government (2009-2017). Apparently, the drone strikes were aimed at removing militant threats; however, the strikes instigated national level resentment across Pakistan owing to perceived notions of violations of state sovereignty, extensive civilian deaths and casualties. The research is an attempt to comprehend how such remote-controlled operations impacted the US-Pak relations and catalyzed anti-American feelings leading to recessed bilateral cooperation.

Methodology: The research uses framework of Constructivism to examine how concepts of identity, norms and perceptions have impacted public discourse and official policy responses in Pakistan. The research is completed using primary data-declassified documents and newspaper reports have been used for analysis which was acquired by accessing different digital archives and newspapers.

Findings: The results reflect a complex paradox: The drone attacks inside Pakistan, owing to their precision, are backed by some sections of local populations in stark opposition to national outcry and diplomatic resentment. Findings of the research highlight rigidity between security essentials and global legal norms, raising critical questions regarding responsibility, legitimacy and long-term apprehensions of remote conflict on international relations and domestic politics inside Pakistan.

Conclusion: The study concluded that the drone strikes, during Obama era, significantly impacted the US-Pak relations;. Importantly, the issue brought to fore critical questions of sovereignty, legality and collateral damage in the form of civilian deaths and casualties. There were sections of population that backed the attacks for their precision and effective bulwark against the militants;. There were others who considered these strikes as a continuous violation of national dignity and a source of anti-American feelings amongst the Pakistani populace. The attacks were shrouded in secrecy and absence of the host-state recognition intensified the public outrage and diplomatic tensions.

Keywords: Counter-terrorism, Drone strikes, Sovereignty, Norms.

Article History

Received:
June 29, 2025

Revised:
September 11, 2025

Accepted:
September 16, 2025

Online:
September 20, 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

Drone attacks that started under the Bush administration peaked in the Obama era. Under President Obama's presidency, 307 drone attacks have been reported in Pakistan. The aggregate of drone attacks comes up to six times higher than the Bush presidency's during his two terms in power. Estimated deaths, as a result of drone strikes, are reported in the range of 2,000 to 3,300. There were 122 drone strikes in Pakistan in 2010 however; the frequency of attacks has subsided over time. Even there were reports of disapproval of the US State Department against them as they were alienating the Pakistani populace which stood at 180 million back then. The drone strikes started as a precision measure against al-Qaeda as part of counter-insurgency efforts that has resultantly had significant consequences for Pakistan (Drone Wars, 2013). Drones strikes result in collateral damage and psychic fear that compromises the intended outcome of these strikes in the form of cumulative alienation. (Department of Defence, 2013) After hue and cry against the drone strikes in Pakistan, the then-CIA Director, Leon Panetta, presented a defense for them terming such strikes as "*the only game in town in terms of confronting and trying to disrupt the al-Qaeda leadership.*" (Department of Defence, 2013)

The employment of advanced unmanned technology raises some scathing questions - who are the people being targeted and why they are targeted, questions about the loss of civilian lives with potential chances of shaping new enemies and more importantly the legal status of such precision strikes under the US and international law in relation to accountability and moral grounds. President Obama addressed those questions in the following words:

"Our actions are effective. Dozens of highly skilled core of al Qaeda commanders, trainers, bomb makers, and operatives have been taken off the battlefield. Plots have been disrupted that would have targeted international aviation, US transit systems, European cities and our troops in Afghanistan. These strikes have saved lives. America's actions are legal..." (The White House, 2013)

The drone attacks were shrouded in secrecy from both the US and Pakistan; however, the evidence of the US targeted killings in Pakistan through drones as part of counter-terrorism is substantiated by an interview of the former Secretary of State, John Kerry. Upon a journalist's inquiries about the timeline of the drone strikes in Pakistan he replied, "*The president has a very real timeline and we hope it's going to be very, very soon.*" This is an outright admission that the drone strikes US conducted very deliberate and pre-planned which made headlines around the world (Kerry, 2013).

Reporting by the Washington Post reveals that secret US documents indicate Pakistani government officials' complicity and endorsement of CIA drone strikes inside Pakistan. Greg Miller and Bob Woodward claimed to have obtained CIA documents and Pakistan's diplomatic memos which reflected that the Pakistani officials were regularly shown classified briefings (Secret Memos, 2013).

1.1 Problem Statement

The Obama era (2009-2017) saw a significant increase in the use of drone strikes in Pakistan to curb terrorism. Since then, the aerial strikes were meant to limit the militant threats; yet, actions were rather unilaterally determined with poor transparency, leading to widespread accusations of violations of sovereignty and civilian targeting across Pakistan. The unilateral approach in conducting these missions led not only to growing distrust in the diplomatic relations between Washington and Islamabad but also to complications in cooperative counter-terrorism operations. Despite common strategic interests, the drone saga entrenched tensions in the bilateral relations that were combined with a pressing inquiry into the long-term implications of military interventions conducted without host-state involvement. This calls for an understanding of how the drone policy during the Obama era influenced diplomatic, military, and public relations between Washington and Islamabad.

1.2 Research Gap

There is plethora of literature that examines the US foreign policy in relation to remote-controlled warfare and counter-terrorism efforts; however, there is a space for research in examining the bilateral relations of the US and Pakistan in relation to drone warfare during the Obama administration. The lack of scholarship opens a research space to investigate as to how the drone attacks impacted the public discourse of domestic politics in Pakistan, the perceptions around civilian casualties, sovereignty violations, diplomatic fallout in addition to long-term security and defense partnership. The research, under investigation, provides a deep investigation of political, military and public domains of the US-Pak relations by discourse analysis of primary data.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The previous scholarship reflects that there exists a significant literature on the US drone attacks inside Pakistan, the study, discussed here, offers a comprehensive understanding about the impacts of the US drone strikes on the US-Pakistan partnership during the Obama administration.

1.4 Hypothesis

H₁: The significant increase in the use of US drone strikes in Pakistan during the Obama era negatively impacted US–Pakistan diplomatic relations by eroding trust, surge in public anti-American sentiment in Pakistan, and weakening of bilateral cooperation in security and counterterrorism departments.

1.5 Research Questions

- 1) How much did the US drone strikes, during the Obama era, impact the diplomatic relations between the US and Pakistan?
- 2) What was the public and private reaction of Pakistani institutions and government officials to the US drone operations within their territory?
- 3) What was the role of civilian casualties and perceived sovereignty violations in shaping public and political discourse in Pakistan regarding the US drone strikes?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Johnston & Sarbahi, (2016) analyze the effects of the US drone attacks on terrorism inside Pakistan. The study finds that drone attacks are linked lethality of terrorist attacks and decrease in the incidence and selective targeting of tribal elders. There is a perception that drone attacks offend Muslim populations which, in turn, promotes recruitment and incites Islamist terrorism. There is a perception of disruption and degradation of terrorist organizations due to drone strikes. Notwithstanding the perceptions, Johnston and Sarbahi conclude that drone strikes augment the US counterterrorism efforts in Pakistan.

Hugh Gusterson that the US drone warfare in Pakistan has been lent legitimacy through a discourse of military humanism: a claim that these drone strikes result in low rates of civilian casualties. However, the counterinsurgency campaign and the tactics of Taliban suggest otherwise. The military has been justified through the concept of Drone essentialism and ethical slippage. (Gusterson, 2019)

Since the beginning of the US drone attacks in 2004-05, the attacks have been the topic of discussion and previous studies have marked the effective use of drone attacks in countering terrorism; however, Ahmad, Jenkins and Iftikhar in their study, Perception of Foreign Drone Strikes by Citizens: The Context of US Drone Strikes in Pakistan, found that there are sentiments of reprisal against the Pakistani government, the armed forces, anti-NATO and the anti-US sentiments. (Ahmed et al., 2017)

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The theory of Constructivism reflects upon the world, and our epistemologically oriented efforts, as socially constructed (Piaget, 1973; Vygotsky, 1978; Fosnot, 2013). The view posits the nature of reality

and the nature of knowledge usually referred to as ontology and epistemology in research discourse. Locating Constructivism in International Relations (IR) can be ascribed to major concepts and phenomena in international relations, such as sovereignty, anarchy, and state interests are not inherent but are socially constructed through mutual interactions and shared understandings among state actors. The theory of Constructivism and its core tenets contrasts with traditional knowledge of Realism and Liberalism which focus on material factors and objective realities. Constructivism is relevant particularly in analyzing how norms, perceptions and identity shape public opinion and diplomatic discourse. In case of US-Pakistan case, the perceived violations of sovereignty and ensuing civilian casualties prejudiced Pakistani public narratives and national identity, which, ultimately, influenced the government to reconsider its collaboration with the US (Theys, 2018).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research is carried out through analyzing primary documents related to the US drone strikes in Obama era and the ensuing events. The research is completed using primary data- declassified documents and newspaper reports have been used for analysis that are acquired by accessing different digital archives and newspapers.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Consequences of US Drone Strikes

The US drone strikes have resulted in resentment across Pakistan. The resentment has been voiced through potential platforms that many a times have soured relations and security cooperation dynamics between the US and Pakistan. However, there have been conflicting voices and reports too against the resentment of drone attacks.

a. Voices in Support of the Drone Strikes

Aqil Shah reporting for Washington Post, conducted semi-structured interviews with the residents of North Waziristan in 2015, in order to assess the perceptions of locals. The sample consisted of maliks, reporters, businessmen, teachers, rights activists, university students, lawyers and members of local chapters of political parties including Jamaat-e-Islami (JI) and Jamiat-e-Ulema Islam (JUI). The interview data busted the prevalent thesis about drone strikes' unpopularity as it contradicted the presumed radicalization effects of drones. The interview data reflect that 79 percent of respondents supported drone attacks for their precision-based targeting of terrorists. In sharp contrast to civilian death claims, those close to the drone attacks areas, constituting 64 percent, believed in the drone strikes' efficacy. Even local politicians of JUI and PTI, that are believed to propound anti-Drone sentiments on their political platforms, dismissed civilian casualties in the drone attacks. Over two-thirds of the respondents said that civilian deaths are those that have either been sympathizers or collaborators. In a shocking claim, many respondents believed that the drone strikes effectively dealt a death blow to the Taliban who had been a nightmare in North Waziristan. (Shah, 2016)

In a now declassified document, a Pakistani scholar based in Oslo, Norway, praised drone strikes and offered an alternative view. The report sums up opinion pieces published in Pakistani newspapers and claim that drone attacks have limited collateral damage. (Department of Defence, 2010a)

b. Resentment in the Public Domain and Pressure on Decision Makers to Respond

There has been considerable blowback against the drone strikes as well and this is evident from repeated voices both in electronic and print media to respond to the attacks. Leading newspapers like the Urdu *Daily Jang*, *The News*, *Geo News* reflected on massive deployment of the US military entourage and NATO troops along Afghan border. Especially *Jang* and *Nawa-i-Waqt* were critical about the US's nerves wracking policy of drone strikes. Even *Nawa-i-Waqt* counselled General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani to shoot

down drone to exercise military prowess and demanded that the US should furnish explanations about its threats to send Pakistan to the Stone Age despite its loss of 40 thousand military personnel along with 70 billion dollars.

Nawa-i-Waqt (the second largest newspaper in Pakistan by circulation) also reported that reckless military action in the form of aerial bombardment is not in the interest of Pakistan and the policy of drone strikes is not only putting Pakistan in a war like situation. These attacks also reflect that the U.S. cares little about independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, resolutions of Pakistan's parliament and more importantly sentiments of the Pakistani masses. US overreach is likely encouraged by the lax attitude of Pakistani political leadership which is ever ready to toe the American line. In order to speed up drone attacks in Waziristan, the Obama administration started kinetic action against the Haqqani network. These attacks were primarily spearheaded by NATO helicopters that violate Pakistani airspace and the Pakistani Air Force was duty-bound to respond in kind after taking the nation into confidence. It is high time for Pakistani political leadership to consider discontinuing its participation in US's War on Terror as Pakistan has already suffered in human and financial numbers.

On another occasion, *Nawa-i-Waqt* reported that General Kayani warned US authorities against further violations of its territorial integrity with kinetic action. The newspaper reported that "fifteen American miscreants" were shot dead in retaliation. The response demonstrated Pakistan's readiness and capability. There was considerable public pressure through print and electronic media that Pakistan should demonstrate its military prowess against drone strikes as well. Iran shot down three drones and if Pakistan could shoot two, the US wouldn't dare send a third one (Pakistan Media Analysis, 2012). Pressure to act against drones is reflected in General Kayani's statement when he told Pakistan's Parliamentary Committee for Defense that Pakistan is a nuclear power and the US will have to think ten times before attacking Pakistan in North Waziristan. This was a striking statement given that it came at the heels of the visit of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and considering Pakistan's dependency on US aid (Media Reaction: Wall Street Protests, US-Pakistan Relations, 2021). An editorial in a Gujarati daily with right-of-center leanings, titled *Mumbai Samachar* called Pakistan's open and public warning to the US a major embarrassment for the US and termed Pakistan disloyal to US (Media Reaction: Wall Street Protests, US-Pakistan Relations, 2021).

There was widespread reporting in *The Frontier Post* and *Daily News* about military exercises of Pakistan aimed at shooting down of drones. They reported a army general saying that Pakistan has the capability to shoot drones but government doesn't want so to avoid spoiling relations with the US. According to reports, Pakistani forces demonstrated a practical capability of shooting a drone at Khudai rangers, Muzzafargarrh. General Ashraf Saleem Malik vowed to continue such exercises to show resilience, capability and boost morale of the forces. (Department of Defence, 2010b)

4.2 America's Guarded Response

Centrist Marathi daily, *Lokmat* reported that the US is cognizant of the double game played by Pakistan. The US, in the latest briefings, overtly expressed concerns over Pakistan's alleged support for the Haqqani network and it is one of the deadliest terrorist factions operating from within Pakistan. Notwithstanding these concerns, the US stance towards Pakistan is soft. The State Department, spokesperson, Mark Toner went to the extent supporting Pakistan against existential threats to stabilize it. This is an open expression of the US attitude that it wants to maintain friendly relations with Pakistan. (Media Reaction: Wall Street Protests, US-Pakistan Relations, India - China Relations, 2012)

4.3 US Pressure to Do More and Act Against the Haqqani Network

Urdu *Daily Jang* reports that there has been monumental pressure on Pakistan from the US to do more; particularly, it is pressurized to take concrete steps in curbing extremism, terrorism and take action against the Haqqani network. Marc Grossman's visit, as US Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, was also a part of the American efforts to increase pressure on Pakistan to do more. The US government

did not appear receptive to the narrative presented by Pakistani government and people. Grossman was of the view that Pakistan, eventually, will have to take action against the Haqqani network as part of counter-terrorism efforts (Pakistan Media Analysis, 2012).

The leadership of Al-Qaeda, on 8 June 2012, conducted a meeting with veteran members of Pakistani Taliban, Afghani Taliban, Haqqani Network, Miram Shah, Peshawar and Quetta Shura, Pakistan. The agenda of the meeting revolved around sending additional fighters to Afghanistan in order to up the ante and offensive operations in the form of suicide operations against the US military forces. The decision and signaling was to avenge and retaliate against the US drone strike that purportedly killed a number of Taliban fighters in June 2012. The emphasis was in the areas where drones killed the fighters. (Department of Defence, 2012)

It is alleged that major source of income for the Haqqani network is from the Quetta based Taliban; minimal funding to the Haqqani network comes from Al-Qaeda. (Afghanistan - Haqqani Network Finances, 2009) Repeatedly Pakistani government, under public pressure and scrutiny, requested the US government to stop the drone attacks, however, Obama, firm in his resolve, warned in December 14, 2009 that the US would not shy away from launching drone strikes inside Pakistan if it found actionable intelligence about the presence of Taliban and Al-Qaeda fighters in particular pockets of Pakistan. (Iqbal, 2009) After harsh scrutiny and audit by the US, military aid by Pakistan to Taliban decreased; resultantly, Taliban resorted to Osama Bin Laden and the Al-Qaeda Organization for material and financial support. Bin Laden provided money, material, recruits and training to the Taliban in its fight against Northern Alliance (State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, 2001).

4.4 Legal Framework Questions and Sovereignty Violations

The latest technology of drone gives rise to pertinent questions - who is the target in these strikes; why they are targeted; how about civilian casualties, deaths and the unintended potential challenge of making new enemies; importantly, an important question to ponder upon is, what is the legal status of such strikes under the US and international law framework leading to questions about accountability and morality. These questions have been addressed by President Obama.

President Obama defended the US drone actions by calling them effective. By taking kinetic actions, based on credible evidence, the US was able to thwart Al-Qaeda and its operatives. Obama argued that it was Congress that authorized the use of force and under national along with international law, that the US was at war with the axis of evil: Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and their connected forces. Advocating that US is at war with a radical group that would kill as many US citizens as it could, if not stopped from doing so. In other words, Obama was of the belief that US is fighting a just war; a just war in the form of a last resort, fought proportionally in self-defense in accordance with international law. The US administration, under the Obama administration, has attempted to define the use of force against terror networks by insisting upon clear guidelines, oversight and accountability in the form of Presidential Policy Guidance. (Remarks by the President at the National Defense University, 2013)

Speaking about unmanned technology of drones for targeted operations in counter-terrorism, Obama was of the view that US has to put legal structure around it to facilitate not only his administration but any future administration as well. He made it clear that there is a need for transparent and legitimate legal understanding for targeted operations. (*Drone Wars*, 2013) The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) voiced concerns on killing of suspected terrorists far beyond the conflict zones thereby blurring the lines between conflict and non-conflict zone. ACLU condemned the program as it violates international law. (Letter by ACLU Executive Director, 2010)

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

The research findings reflect that the America's drone attacks inside Pakistan during the Obama period had deep political, diplomatic and social implications. Surprisingly, the data derived from media discourse and declassified documents, project a contradiction in local public perceptions about the drone strikes.

There are some sections of population notably from the conflict zone areas, such as North Waziristan, who believe in these precision-based strikes, they hold that these attacks assist in confronting terrorist attacks; in opposition to these views, there is a section of population constituted by a broad national agenda who equate these attacks with sovereignty violations and civilian casualties. The paradox arising out of endorsement of drone action and a broad nationwide outcry against them reflect a duplicitous narrative driven by media and political propaganda.

Moreover, the research does indicate an undermining of trust between the US and Pakistan. The officials of Pakistan publicly denounced the drone strikes but were complicit in tacit approval to these attacks. This underscores a complicated relationship of compliance under the US pressure and local public diplomacy. The right-oriented media of Pakistan exerted pressure for retaliation and simultaneously distancing itself from the US-led drone attacks and putting them in total disregard to national dignity. This caused alienation between the US and Pakistan in terms of bilateral relationship.

The framework of Constructivism claims that perceptions, identity and norms formed the larger debate around these strikes. The drone attacks were a reflection of power disparity and imposition of foreign will which, in turn, instigated anti-American sentiments. Pakistan's public officials were compelled to wear defensive posture at home simultaneously sustaining a strategic partnership with the US. Moreover, the haughty behavior of the US stoked such extreme tensions.

To summarize, the study shows how one-sided counter-terrorism remote-controlled drone strikes notwithstanding strategic over-extension fracture diplomatic relations, instigate public opinion and spoil long-term partnership. The study proposes that any future counter-terrorism defense partnership should be embodied in harmony of security goals driven by global norms and keeping in mind domestic sensibilities to work against diplomatic damage.

6. CONCLUSION

To sum up, it can be said that the drone attacks inside Pakistan, during Obama era, significantly impacted the US-Pak relations. Importantly, the issue brought to fore critical questions of sovereignty, legality and collateral damage in the form of civilian deaths and casualties. There were sections of population that backed the attacks for their precision and effective bulwark against the militants. There were others who considered these strikes as a continuous violation of national dignity and a source of anti-American feelings amongst the Pakistani populace. The attacks were shrouded in secrecy and absence of the host-state recognition intensified the public outrage and diplomatic tensions. Though, touted as counter-terrorism efforts, the unilateral nature of attacks emboldened long-term implications thereby suggesting that however precision guided these attacks may be, they can corrode trust and create resistance.

Acknowledgments

None.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding Source

The authors received No funding to conduct this study.

ORCID's

Dalir Khan¹  <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6880-4694>

Saira Baig²  <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0623-6839>

REFERENCES

- Afghanistan—Haqqani Network Finances*. (2009, September 24). Unredacted.com. <https://unredacted.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/hqn3.pdf>
- Ahmed, Z. S., Jenkins, B., & Iftikhar, W. (2017). Perception of Foreign Drone Strikes by Citizens: The Context of US Drone Strikes in Pakistan. *South Asian Survey*, 24(2), 135–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971523118822442>
- Department of Defence. (2010a, 09). [Excised] *Pakistani Scholar Praises Drone Strikes and Offers an Alternative Analysis on the Tribes*. National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/30471-1-excised-pakistani-scholar-praises-drone-strikes-and-offers-alternative-analysis>
- Department of Defence. (2010b, January 22). [Excised] *Pak. Army Air Defense Units Conduct Firing Exercises against Drones*. National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/30472-2-excised-pak-army-air-defense-units-conduct-firing-exercises-against-drones>
- Department of Defence. (2012, August 7). [Excised] *Senior Members of Peshawar Shura, Miram Shah Shura, Pakistan Taliban, and al-Qa'ida Plan for Increased Operations against U.S. Forces in Afghanistan*. National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/30474-4-excised-senior-members-peshawar-shura-miram-shah-shura-pakistan-taliban-and-al>
- Department of Defence. (2013, June 27). [Excised] *Atmospherics in Pakistan following May 2013 Elections*. National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/30475-5-excised-atmospherics-pakistan-following-may-2013-elections>
- Drone Wars: The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killings: Hearing on S. Hrg. 113-876 before the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary* (2013). <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-113shrg26147/html/CHRG-113shrg26147.htm>
- Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.). (2013). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gusterson, H. (2019). Drone Warfare in Waziristan and the New Military Humanism. *Current Anthropology*, 60(S19), S77–S86. <https://doi.org/10.1086/701022>
- Iqbal, A. (2009, December 15). Obama Refuses to Rule out Drone Attacks in Quetta. *DAWN.COM*. <https://www.dawn.com/2009/12/15/obama-refuses-to-rule-out-drone-attacks-in-quetta/>
- Johnston, P. B., & Sarbahi, A. K. (2016). The Impact of US Drone Strikes on Terrorism in Pakistan. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(2), 203–219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqv004>
- Kerry, J. (2013, August 1). *Interview with Maryam Chaudhry of Pakistan TV* [Interview]. https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/59-2_normand_decl_ex.2_12.23.15.pdf
- Letter by ACLU Executive Director to President Barack Obama*. (2010, April 28). Intelligence Resource Program - Federation of American Scientists; Intelligence In Congress. https://irp.fas.org/congress/2010_hr/042810aclu.pdf
- Media Reaction: Wall Street Protests, US-Pakistan Relations, India—China Relations, Kashmir, India-Vietnam-Chian, China—Pakistan Relations; New Delhi* (Case No. F-2012-23432). (2012, May 11). US Department of State. https://foia.state.gov/DOCUMENTS/1-FY2013/F-2012-23432/DOC_0C05164529/C05164529.pdf
- Media Reaction: Wall Street Protests, US-Pakistan Relations, US Economy; New Delhi* (Case No. F-2012-23432). (2021, May 11). US Department of State; Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

https://foia.state.gov/DOCUMENTS/1-FY2013/F-2012-23432/DOC_0C05164519/C05164519.pdf

Pakistan Media Analysis, October 11, 2011 (Case No. F-2012-23432). (2012, May 11). US Department of State; Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). https://foia.state.gov/DOCUMENTS/1-FY2013/F-2012-23432/DOC_0C05164477/C05164477.pdf

Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education*. Grossman.

Remarks by the President at the National Defense University. (2013, May 23). The White House: President Barack Obama. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/node/215461#transcript>

Secret memos “show Pakistan endorsed US drone strikes.” (2013, October 24). *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-24649840>

Shah, A. (2016, May 17). Drone Blowback in Pakistan is a Myth. Here’s Why. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. <https://carnegieendowment.org/posts/2016/05/drone-blowback-in-pakistan-is-a-myth-heres-why?lang=en>

State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Report: “Afghanistan: Al-Qaida Military Contribution to the Taliban,” SECRET. (2001, October 1). National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/24668-state-department-bureau-intelligence-and-research-report-afghanistan-al-qaida>

The White House Office of the Press Secretary. (2013, May 23). *Fact Sheet: The President’s May 23 Speech on Counterterrorism*. The White House: President Barack Obama. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/23/fact-sheet-president-s-may-23-speech-counterterrorism>

Theys, S. (2018, February 23). Introducing Constructivism in International Relations Theory. *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/23/introducing-constructivism-in-international-relations-theory/>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Harvard University Press.